REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 719 UD 002 268

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION STUDY OF THE MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM.

BY- HAMBURGER, MARTIN
NEW YORK CITY DEPT. OF PERSONNEL, N.Y.

PUB DATE 7 APR 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.00 75P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *DROPOUT PREVENTION, *WORK STUDY PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, MOTIVATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *STUDENT BEHAVIOR, ATTITUDES, COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS, NEGROES, PUERTO RICANS, TESTS, INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, CONTROL GROUPS, NEW YORK CITY, MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

A DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION HAS BEEN MADE OF A NEW YORK CITY COOPERATIVE PROGRAM TO MOTIVATE POTENTIAL DROPOUTS AND TO PROVIDE THEM WITH SUPERVISED, PAID EMPLOYMENT AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE. THE BASIC STUDY SAMPLE WAS CONFINED TO GROUPS, BOYS AND GIRLS, IN FOUR PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO-PUERTO RICAN HIGH SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY. THE PROGRAM WAS EVALUATED BY (1) INTELLIGENCE, APTITUDE, ACHIEVEMENT, AND ATTITUDE TESTS, (2) INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES, (3) ON -THE-JOB OBSERVATIONS, AND (4) OTHER DATA WHICH INCLUDED GRADE, DISCIPLINARY, AND ANECDOTAL INFORMATION. FOR PURPOSES OF COMPARISON, A CONTROL GROUP WAS FORMED. SIGNIFICANTLY, THE PROGRAM GROUP AVERAGED A 5.50 IQ-POINT INCREASE OVER THE 1.55 POINT INCREASE OF THE CONTROLS. THE PROGRAM GROUP IMPROVED IN GENERAL ATTITUDE, ATTENDANCE, AND OTHER NONACADEMIC BEHAVIOR. HOWEVER, WHILE THE NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AMONG THE PROGRAM GROUP EXCEEDED THAT OF THE CONTROL GROUP, THEIR LEVEL OF VOCATIONAL ASPIRATION DID NOT NOTICEABLY RISE. THEIR ABSENCE ON THE JOB AND THEIR LATENESS WAS GREATER THAN THAT OF REGULAR EMPLOYEES. YET, SUCH AN INTEGRATED CURRICULUM WHICH INCORPORATES SCHOOL AND JOB EXPERIENCES IS IMPORTANT IN EDUCATING UNMOTIVATED DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. APPENDIXES INCLUDE ABSTRACTS OF INTERVIEWS AND DATA ON THE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS, CONTENT OF THE PROGRAM, AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONCERNS. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ABSTRACTED

02268

Letter Se
11/9/6
w

ED012719

UD 002 268

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION STUDY
OF THE
MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE
EDUCATION AND WORK PROGRAM

BY
MARTIN HAMBURGER, PH.D.

SUBMITTED
TO

CITY OF NEW YORK
ROBERT F. WAGNER
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
THEODORE H. LANG
CITY PERSONNEL DIRECTOR

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION STUDY
OF THE
MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Submitted by:
Martin Hamburger, Ph.D
Professor of Education
New York University

April 7, 1965

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL—CITY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
220 CHURCH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10013 ■ TELEPHONE: 566 - 8707

THEODORE H. LANG
CHAIRMAN & CITY PERSONNEL DIRECTOR

May 5, 1965

The New York City Department of Personnel has reproduced this report so that copies may be available for the information of persons and organizations interested in the problems of school dropouts and job training for young people. The study was planned and arranged by the Manpower Utilization Council. When that body was abolished, responsibility for obtaining and distributing the final report was assigned to the Department of Personnel.

While New York City is the only governmental jurisdiction to have attempted an extensive work-study cooperative education program in connection with municipal operations, many other governmental jurisdictions have indicated interest in developing this type of program and at least one - The State of New York - is attempting a limited program. This report should be of interest to these jurisdictions.

The Board of Education has been the co-sponsor and full partner in this program. Its strong efforts in instituting and maintaining the program have been instrumental in the solid achievement that is delineated in this report.

Between the conclusion of the study and the preparation of the report both the Board of Education and the Department of Personnel have instituted additional activities to improve, extend and enrich the program. Information with respect to these may be obtained from these agencies.

We in City government have found this program difficult but rewarding in every sense. The participating City agencies and cultural institutions - there are some 68 of them - have been exemplary in their willingness to employ trainees, to devote supervisory and training time to their development on the job and to retain trainees beyond graduation wherever possible. This program has permitted us to make a personal contribution and to participate directly in the major community action of our day -- the attempt to equalize opportunity and eradicate poverty. And, we are sure that any other organizations, governmental or private, instituting a similar program will find it equally rewarding.

On behalf of my staff and myself I wish to thank Dr. Martin Hamburger for his efforts in making this study much more than an exercise in academic research. He brought to the study knowledge, creativity and enthusiasm. These have clearly paid off in providing us with suggestions and guide lines for an improved program.

I thank the Ford Foundation for its assistance in support of the Municipal Cooperative Education and Work Program and for making this study possible.

Theodore H. Lang

Theodore H. Lang
City Personnel Director

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION STUDY
OF THE
MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Introduction

This report deals with selected aspects of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program rather than with the Program as a whole. While the Evaluation Study was largely confined to four high schools there are nevertheless implications for the entire Program. It should be noted that the concept of the Program evaluation in cooperative education and work programs is relatively new and that design, criteria, controlled study, appropriate measures, and data-gathering have accordingly presented considerable problems. The report that follows reflects such problems but it should be stated that from the present investigator's survey of the literature and his first-hand knowledge the difficulties encountered are within the expected range. They are cited here to provide a realistic context for the research and evaluation. This report is seen as an aid to future program development as well as in the design of evaluation studies. Technical footnotes are provided whereever they are deemed helpful, but the body of the report is only minimally concerned with methodology.

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION STUDY
OF THE
MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

I. Developing the Study of the Program

A. Background of the Evaluation Study

In the original Letter of Grant from the Ford Foundation to the New York City Board of Education dated July 24, 1961, an allocation of $26,000 was made for purposes of conducting an independent evaluation of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program. In November, 1961, some time after the Program actually got under way, Mr. O. William Ross, Executive Director of the Manpower Utilization Council, contacted Professor Martin Hamburger of New York University about conducting this Evaluation. By that time the very rapid development of the Program had in an extraordinarily short time placed 375 young people in municipal jobs. It was evident that the major pressure at that point was on program development and, thus, some time passed before an agreement was reached between the Manpower Utilization Council and Dr. Hamburger to conduct the Study.

The actual contract was developed with Dr. Roscoe Brown and Research Survey Associates. On February 26, 1962 a memorandum (Appendix A) which was intended to serve as a contract was prepared by Dr. Hamburger at the request of Mr. Ross. However, as a result of factors not involving either Dr. Hamburger or Dr. Brown, a contract between Research Survey Associates and Dr. Theodore H. Lang, Director of Personnel of New York City and Chairman of the Manpower Utilization Council was not signed until May 2, 1962. During this time no official contact with the Board of Education was possible in order to begin appropriate arrangements for conducting the Study.

The life of the contract was originally planned to be from February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1964. The preliminary planning and developmental stage was to involve the school term from February to June 1962. The study period was to run from September 1962 to June 1963, and a data-analysis and report-writing period was planned from July 1963 to January 1964. Hiring of staff was not possible while negotiations were proceeding and it was not until the very end of April that a research assistant could be employed with any assurance. Other appointments were also deferred. Official contact with the New York City Board of Education was then made to develop plans for visits during the remainder of the spring term of 1962 as well as for pilot studies during the summer of 1962, and to enter the schools for actual conduct of the Study in the fall.

About the time discussions began, two major events at the Board of Education occurred: Superintendent John Theobald, who had been directly involved in the development of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program, resigned; and secondly, Associate Superintendent (for High School Division), Fred Schoenberg, who was a member of the Manpower Utilization Council, suffered a heart attack in early 1962. Together with the hiatus due to contract negotiations, the new problems of establishing contact and making arrangements for conducting the Study in the schools led to further delay. Thus, it was not until May 1962 that it was possible to meet with Acting Associate Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Maurice D. Hopkins, in order to begin planning for the Study year 1962-63. On May 15, 1962, after the meeting, Dr. Hamburger submitted a memorandum (Appendix B) to Dr. Hopkins formally stating the nature of the Study and requesting permission to enter and work in the schools. Specific reference was made in the closing paragraph to the desirability of conducting an initial pilot study in the remaining month before the school year ended. On June 8, 1962, at the suggestion of Dr. Hopkins, a copy of the memorandum was forwarded to Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Research at the Board of Education. On June 19th Dr. Wrightstone acknowledged receipt of this memorandum and indicated that permission would be forthcoming from Dr. Hopkins.

In the succeeding months, however, permission was not granted and no official contacts were possible with the schools. The pilot study was therefore confined to interviews with students who were on the job during the summer. These interviews were conducted at New York University by Mr. Bruce Bernstein, Research Assistant to Dr. Hamburger. It was not until September 10th that a meeting of Dr. Hopkins, Miss Grace Brennan, Director of the Cooperative Education Program, Dr. Hamburger and Mr. Bernstein was finally arranged, and here several reservations were voiced about the Study by Dr. Hopkins: these were then clarified to mutual satisfaction. By this time the possibility of doing any "pre-testing" had been lost. Under the terms of a memorandum from Dr. Hopkins to the principals of selected high schools (Appendix C) dated September 12, 1962 (received by Dr. Hamburger on September 21st), cooperation was requested in terms of time, testing, conferences, and other aspects of the Study.

In effect, for various reasons, primarily school scheduling, arrangements with even four schools (the basic Study sample) could not be concluded until early October. Any discussion, therefore, of design in terms of "pre-and post" interviewing, testing and controlled observations needs to be understood in this context. The possibility was considered of deferring to a later time the more rigorous type of study but the need for concurrent evaluation research was paramount. A fuller statement of the Evaluation design as it now evolved should serve to clarify the reasons for the decision to proceed under the circumstances.

B. Purpose and Design of the Evaluation Study

First, the goals and purpose of the Ford Foundation in making its grant should be noted: To provide part-time employment for low socioeconomic groups; "primarily it (the Program) is aimed at keeping young people in school; to provide these young people with supervised employment as part of their education, thus improving their work skills and their stability so as to aid them in obtaining better full-time employment upon graduation."

With the over-all goals of the Foundation in mind, the Evaluation Study was originally conceived in broad terms to yield: 1) a better understanding of the procedures and administrative aspects of the Program, 2) a description of the students, their demographic characteristics, the effects of the Program on their attitudes, skills and over-all development, 3) the nature of the jobs and job experiences provided through the Program, and 4) the relationship between the school and school experiences and the job situations involved. The approach adopted was essentially descriptive recognizing that the entire project would be much more of a study than an evaluation. Certain additional specific problems which were considered as falling within the purview of such a Study included 1) the extent to which minority youth were being reached, 2) the extent to which such minority youth were being placed in upgrading types of job situations, and 3) the extent to which both municipal agencies and schools were able to provide a sympathetic and appropriate climate for socially disadvantaged youth.

The design of the Study, as presented in a memorandum to Dr. Jackson Toby of the Ford Foundation, December 21, 1962, was at that point already a modification of the original design presented to Mr. Ross and the Manpower Utilization Council, and was intended to take into account the developments described in the previous section. Appendix D is the basic design: it should be noted that there was to be a concentration on four schools containing a large number of Negro and Puerto Rican youths, thus permitting a manageable Study to be done if the research were so limited. It was planned that there would be tape-recorded interviews with all the boys in the Program and with some girls, the emphasis on the boys being made at the suggestion of Dr. Toby and Mr. Hunter of the Ford Foundation. The original design was "before-and-after" but was changed to a Phase I (early in the school year) and Phase II (as late as possible in the school year) design instead. The design also called for controls and with the cooperation of the four schools comparable boys and girls were selected for study. In addition to the interviews, a sequence of tests and questionnaires was to be administered to both "coops" and controls.

In addition to the study of the students themselves, the plan called for field observations on the actual job location as well as for visits to classrooms so as to appraise the conditions and circumstances under which the individuals in the program were actually functioning.

The plan for analysis of data involved the use of discrepancy scores (changes between the two phases), tests of significant differences between the "coops" and controls, correlations between selected status variables and the dependent variables being studied, factor analysis to determine commonalities, and qualitative analysis of interview materials and other instruments as they reflected attitudes and feelings not otherwise measurable.

It is already clear from the previous section that, except in its broad outlines, the actual Study as conducted resulted in an emphasis on certain features of the above design and only a minimal attempt to deal with others. The procedures and instruments which were actually used are described in the next section.

C. Procedures and Instruments Used in the Study

It is notable that the experimental and observational research was eventually combined with direct participation by the Study Director at the suggestion of the Ford Foundation as reflected in the mid-year memorandum from Mr. David Hunter dated February 5, 1963 (Appendix E). The Study Director was thus increasingly involved in the program itself, insofar as policy matters, communications aspects, and training of school and supervisory personnel were concerned. As to the data-gathering aspects of the Study, details follow:

1. Procedures

With the pre-post approach changed to Phase I - Phase II, interviewing and testing at each of the four schools were conducted from October to January in the first phase and from April to June in the second phase. A six-month interval was possible in all schools except when individual absences or work schedules interfered. The schedule was arranged in cooperation with the principals and coordinators in each of the four Study schools but no report of this Study can be meaningful and helpful unless the problems of scheduling are stated.[1, 2] While conditions for interviewing were frequently unfavorable, at least 200 usable interviews were obtained in the first phase and nearly 100 in the second.

The Study Director visited each school at least four times and conferred with the principal, the coordinator and various guidance personnel. He conducted some of the testing at Seward Park and Benjamin Franklin High Schools. The Research Assistant

---

[1] Investigators conducting such studies should be greatly concerned with the planning of testing, interviewing and observations so that a true "pre-test" period is indeed that. The great control to be obtained by a firm administrative order may be diminished by the resentment or apathy of the principal, teachers and students in a particular situation. In a typical school April and May should be the period during which plans for September are firmly organized and all contingencies allowed for.

[2] Specific problems encountered may clarify the general procedural problems: With cooperative students in school on alternating weeks and in some cases, as with hospital employees, in two-week intervals, with controls available only through certain subject-matter classes in some schools and homerooms in other schools, with different administrative patterns and lack of available testing rooms, the time, expense and energy required to administer the various instruments with professional standards made this aspect of the Study much more expensive and complicated than was anticipated.

It should also be noted that holding on to controls from Phase I to Phase II was extremely difficult because students were typically redistributed at mid-year. As a matter of fact, since there was no compulsion for any student to take any of the tests or appear at interviews, it is remarkable that as many subjects as were finally usable did report for both phases of the Study.

As for the interviews, the problems of scheduling appropriate space for conducting and recording interviews were also quite serious and should not be glossed over. There were many, many cases in which interviewers would wait while two or three students in a row did not show up. While this varied from school to school, in all cases extremely careful scheduling was done, but the attitudes and absences of students, sometimes coordinators (in not providing planned substitutes in case of absence), and sometimes teachers, resulted in high proportions of wasted interviewer time.

was at each school at least 10 half-days during the study year. Both investigators were in continual telephone contact with the schools. They each had several conferences with Miss Brennan or with members of Miss Brennan's staff, and each observed selection and placement interviews conducted at each school and at the Board of Education.

Classroom observations were quite limited, and included group meetings of coop students with the coordinator as observed by the Study Director and his assistant as well as classroom visits and teacher conferences in 3 of the schools by Prof. Louise Hock of New York University, a secondary school curriculum specialist. The latter visits involved only the most limited contact.

A final group of observations and visits were those made by Dr. Hamburger and Mr. Bernstein at various municipal agencies. The Study Director visited 10 different job installations and his assistant visited 15 others. In most cases they were accompanied by either a field representative of the City Personnel Department or a member of the Board of Education Cooperative Educational Staff or both.

The data gathered from all observations are reported in Part III of this report but in a qualitative fashion inasmuch as systematic sampling of opinion and evidence was not possible.

At each of the schools arrangements were made whereby the records of students included in the coop sample as well as the controls could be photocopied. A copying machine and clerical assistants were thus employed in obtaining test scores, grades, anecdotal data and disciplinary information for each student. These data were supplemented at the end of the study year and corrected during the following fall.[1]

It may be seen from the foregoing that great emphasis was placed on the data about the students. This decision was one of priority in time, funds and available resources. Testing, interviewing, record-keeping were given such priority; visits, job analysis and curriculum analysis could not be conducted at the same intensive level.

---

[1] One of the most difficult methodological problems in schools with high turnover rates (Morris High School has an 85% turnover a year) is to determine who is or is not in a given sample; who is a drop-out, either from school in general or from day-school; who is actually coop (non-Municipal Coop Students were sometimes combined); who is in the 11th or 12th grades; graduating or not. One frustration was that rosters and records were not preserved in two schools so that "gaps" could never be filled.

2. Instruments Used in the Study

The brevity of the interval between Phase I and Phase II was the same for coops and controls and consequently if significant changes occurred they could be assumed to be the result of the Program.

Attached are samples (Exhibits A to G) of each of the instruments used. The following is a description of each:

a) *Stanford Achievement Test*, Advanced Battery, Form JM, Arithmetic Reasoning and Reading sub-tests. These tests have norms down to the 7th grade and were therefore deemed appropriate for the students in this group who were so often behind in basic skills despite the fact that they were 11th and 12th graders. The relevance of this instrument for understanding the growth and development of the subjects of this Study appears self-evident but the rationale should be made explicit. If upgrading took place in the direction of white collar or technical job skills, then the impact of the Program should have measurable effects on the appropriate basic skills.

b) *Otis Intelligence Test*, Self-Administered, Gamma, Form EM. This is the best known and most widely used paper-and-pencil test of scholastic aptitude but its applicability here is especially important as this kind of test greatly resembles the typical Civil Service examination. Together with the Stanford Achievement Test, the Otis would provide a measure of change in the direction sought by this Program.

c) *Differential Aptitude Test* Battery, Form A, Clerical Test. This brief test of clerical speed and accuracy is especially relevant to the large numbers of cooperative students who were in the office work area.

d) *The Work Values Inventory*, developed by Donald E. Super and Associates at Teachers College, Columbia University, currently being standardized after 15 years of experimental work, was used to measure changes in work attitudes and values.[1] The scores are derived on 15 different scales and these scales are described in the appendix.

e) *Life Planning Questionnaire*, developed by Martin Hamburger for the Career Pattern Study at Teachers College, to compare and contrast levels of aspiration and levels of expectation in a number of areas, vocational and educational. Since one aspect of the Program was to raise levels of aspiration and motivation, an objective measure, other than the interview, was necessary.

---

[1] The present investigator has collaborated on this instrument from its beginnings and prepared a version, in agreement with Dr. Super, which modified several vocabulary items that were deemed difficult.

f) Incomplete Sentences Blank by J. B. Rotter, High School Form. (Additional items concerned with job attitudes were developed by the Career Pattern Study under Donald Super.) Special scoring methods were obtained from Dr. Rotter. As a projective instrument it is considered to be one of the few ways through which adjustment or personality may be measured indirectly short of intensive clinical analysis.

g) Additional student data were obtained from school records. These included records of absence, lateness, discipline slips, grades, school tests, etc. It is important to reiterate here that the original data as photocopied frequently had gaps and clerical inaccuracies which required return visits to check further. Methods of treating these data are outlined in the next section.

h) Job ratings were obtained for each of the coop students and were used as a criterion variable.

i) The Interview Schedule, a copy of which is appended. Although refined over the years in similar types of research, this was subjected to intensive revision to make it appropriate for the present Study.[1]

j) Revised Occupational Scale for Measuring Socioeconomic Status (Exhibit H), developed by Martin Hamburger. A widely used measure applicable to rating the status of both coops and controls as well as in rating levels of occupational aspiration and expectation. The scale runs from Level 1, high-level professional and executive, to Level 7, irregularly employed people in very menial jobs.

---

[1] An important aspect of the testing, interviewing, and data-gathering was the careful training of all part-time personnel. Five experienced interviewers (2 Ph.D.'s, 3 Ph.D. candidates with all course work completed and extensive experience) met for three training sessions. All test administrators and proctors were oriented to the special purposes of the tests and were prepared to deal with the various problems that were actually encountered.

II. EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAM ON THE PARTICIPANTS

The findings that are presented in this section of the Report are of two kinds: A) Statistical Data[1] selected from the vast body of material which computer procedures produced; B) Interview and other data not subjected to statistical treatment but to qualitative analysis to supplement and enrich the statistical findings.

Both kinds of data deal with the students per se, and are discussed from that standpoint. In Section III, observations of the program as distinct from student data are reported and discussed.

A. Findings Based on Statistical Analysis

A number of Tables which detail the statistical data are presented as support for the findings reported herein. The most salient findings may be summarized as follows:

1. The Coop and Control groups were drawn from the same basic population as demonstrated by the absence of a single significant difference in the characteristics listed in Table I. It is also evident from this table that the coop and control groups came from low-skill families representative of the disadvantaged population of the city and are also older than the normal high school population.

2. Perhaps the most significant findings relating to change in the coop students are found in Table II.

   a) The mean increase of 5.50 points in IQ for the coops is far beyond expectation and is clearly and significantly greater than that obtained by the controls (1.55 points in IQ).

---

[1] While some interview and test data were obtained for more than 300 coop students and for nearly 300 controls, several factors account for the Coop N of 108 and Control N of 91 used throughout the Tables that follow. Most important is the decision to analyze only the data for boys. Then too, over 40 male coops were studied who had been in the program the previous year and were continuing in the 1962-63 year: these were not included. Other coops were carryovers who graduated in January 1963. Still others had too few tests to permit use as subjects. The attrition rate for controls is accounted for mostly by lack of accessibility from Phase I to Phase II.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF COOPS AND CONTROLS ON SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	COOP			CONTROL			
	M	SD	N*	M	SD	N*	t#
e In Years (as of 6/63)	18-2 mos.	9 mos.	108	18-3 mos.	11 mos.	91	.76
o. Years in N.Y.C. (as of 6/63)	13.6 yrs.	5.9 yrs.	91	13.5 yrs.	6.7 yrs.	61	.13
om Ratio (Persons/Rooms)	1.20	.53	85	1.09	.42	59	1.29
ather's Occup.**	5.24	.95	58	5.23	1.04	42	.02
other's Occup.** (where father's occup. not available)	5.45	.72	22	5.27	1.04	18	.62
ather's Educ. (by grade)	9.42	2.80	56	9.47	3.72	36	.06
other's Educ. (by grade)	9.53	3.50	65	10.19	3.04	42	.97

varies as complete records and data were very difficult to obtain.

*Using Hamburger's Revised Occupational Scale of Socioeconomic Status.

one of the t-tests were significant.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF COOPS AND CONTROLS ON CHANGES IN SCHOLASTIC AND RELATED APTITUDES

	COOP (N=108)		CONTROL (N=91)		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
Otis IQ					
Phase I	84.00	11.00	85.17	10.38	.76
Phase II	89.61	11.16	86.64	11.23	1.83
Discrepancy	5.50##	--	1.55##	--	5.59**
D.A.T. CLERICAL TEST (RAW SCORES)					
Phase I	46.07	9.98	46.90	11.76	.53
Phase II	52.87	9.38	51.12	12.00	1.14
Discrepency	6.80##	--	4.58##	--	2.18*
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST (GRADE EQUIVALENTS)					
Word Meaning					
Phase I	8.24	2.40	8.70	2.10	1.44
Phase II	8.64	2.40	9.27	2.10	2.04
Discrepancy	.40	--	.57	--	1.28
Paragraph Meaning					
Phase I	7.75	2.50	8.14	2.40	1.06
Phase II	8.47	2.40	8.74	2.50	.76
Discrepancy	.72	--	.60	--	.62
Arithmetic Reasoning					
Phase I	7.27	1.90	7.66	1.90	1.40
Phase II	7.56	1.80	7.78	1.90	.79
Discrepancy	.29	--	.12	--	.77

Difference between pre and post means significant at 1% level
* Significant at 5% level
** Significant at 1% level

b) A similarly significant difference occurs in the D.A.T. Clerical Test, although of lesser magnitude.

c) No such differences occurred in the Stanford Achievement sub-tests which are largely measures of skill development.

3. There was consistently greater improvement in class marks for the coop group which was reflected in a statistically significant difference in term average. It is to be noted that the coop group started from a lower baseline. (see Table II)

4. The two indices of non-academic school behavior shown in Table IV indicates a greater improvement by the coops and a highly significant difference in improved attendance.

5. On two measures of adjustment and motivation the following findings are outstanding:

a) The measures of adjustment (Incomplete Sentence Blank) for both groups were closely comparable to the general high school norms.
b) The data from the Life Planning Questionnaire show that the disadvantaged youth as a group started with a modest level of educational and vocational aspiration which did not change significantly during the Study. (Table V)

6. The correlations between IQ and certain selected variables seem to be more significant in the case of the coops than in the control group. Most notable is the relationship between IQ and economic motivation measures. (Table VI)

7. Table VII indicates an attempt to uncover relationships between several of the variables involved. While no firm statistical conclusions are possible, certain trends are discernible:

a) A decrease in vocational expectations among the more highly rated on the job.
b) A higher self-estimate (Best-Fitted, Post) among the more highly rated on the job.
c) A general positive relationship between academic and job performance.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF COOPS AND CONTROLS ON SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT MEASURES

	(COOP (N=108)		(CONTROL (N=91)		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
GLISH AVERAGE					
Before Program Year	68.62	6.45	70.75	7.11	2.21*
Program Year	70.65	6.06	71.47	7.79	.82
Discrepancy	2.03	--	.72	--	.87
OCIAL STUDIES AVERAGE					
Before Program Year	69.61	7.62	70.08	8.70	.14
Program Year	71.81	7.48	71.94	8.58	.11
Discrepancy	2.20	--	1.86	--	.27
RM AVERAGE					
Before Program Year	69.97	8.92	70.69	8.58	.57
Program Year	73.53	5.40	71.75	6.77	2.05*
Discrepancy	3.56	--	1.06	--	2.49*

Significant at 5% Level

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF COOPS AND CONTROLS ON INDICES OF SCHOOL BEHAVIOR

	(COOP (N=108)	(CONTROL (N=91)	
	M	M	t
K SLIPS (NUMBER PER TERM)			
Before Program Year	.76	.90	1.79
Program Year	.20	.60	.50
Discrepancy	.56	.30	1.10
TENDANCE (DAYS ABSENT)			
Before Program Year	8.09	7.10	1.15
Program Year	6.02	7.31	1.62
Discrepancy	2.07	-.21	2.69**

Significant at 1% Level

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF COOPS AND CONTROLS ON SELECTED PERSONALITY AND MOTIVATIONAL VARIABLES

	COOP (N=108)		CONTROL (N=91)		
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	t
DJUSTMENT MEASURED BY NCOMPLETE SENTENCE BLANK					
Phase I	121.36	10.37	123.07	12.98	1.03
Phase II	121.80	13.03	123.45	13.22	.88
Discrepancy	.44	--	.38	--	.09
IFE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE					
Lev. Voc. Asp. I#	3.11	1.35	3.29	1.46	.89
Lev. Voc. Asp. II#	3.29	1.42	3.26	1.25	.19
Best Fit. I#	3.69	1.34	3.54	1.43	.66
Best Fit. II#	3.71	1.31	3.74	1.27	.15
Lev. Voc. Exp. I#	3.83	1.23	3.77	1.49	.29
Lev. Voc. Exp. II#	3.96	1.17	3.95	1.47	.06
Lev.Ed.Asp. I) Yrs. of Educ.	3.2	.19	3.5	.20	--
Lev.Ed.Asp.II) After H.S.	3.3	.19	3.4	.19	--
Discrepancy	.1	--	-.1	--	1.02
Lev.Ed.Exp. I) "	1.6	.18	1.8	.19	--
Lev.Ed.Exp.II)	1.7	.18	1.8	.19	--
Discrepancy	.1	--	--	--	.25
Lev.Pay Like I (In Dollars	$84.20	--	$82.00	--	.72
Lev.Pay Like II(per week)	87.50	--	82.50	--	1.66
Pay Fut.Like I ("	$124.00	--	$119.00	--	.94
Pay Fut.Like II (	138.00	--	132.00	--	.62
Pay Fut.Exp. I ("	$105.00	--	$110.00	--	.69
Pay Fut.Exp. II (	120.00	--	110.00	--	1.71
Discrepancy	15.00	--	00.00	--	2.25*

#Socioeconomic Level as measured by Hamburger's Revised Occupational Scale of Socioeconomic Status.

Significant at 5% level.

TABLE VI

CORRELATION OF I.Q. vs. SELECTED VARIABLES

Variable	I.Q. Phase I		I.Q. Phase II	
	Coop. N = 108	Control N = 91	Coop. N = 108	Control N = 91
No. Yrs. N. Y. C.	.27	-.22	.25	-.12 *
D.A.T. Clerical Phase I	.26	.31	.26	.25
D.A.T. Clerical Phase II	.33	.30	.37	.26
English Pre-Program	.25	.22	.19	.22
English Post-Program	.38	.32	.35	.33
Soc.Studies Pre-Program	.17 *	-.07 *	.14 *	-.01 *
Soc.Studies Post-Program	.30	.49	.28	.55
School Average Pre-Program	.35	.37	.32	.39
School Average Post-Program	.21	.20	.24	.20
"Pink Slips" Pre-Program	.15 *	-.02 *	.21	-.07 *
Pay Future Like Pre-Program	.23	.26	.25	.16 *
Pay Future Like Post-Program	.20	.17 *	.20	.13 *
Pay Future Exp. Post-Program	.23	.01 *	.25	.01 *
WVI Security I	.45	.15 *	.45	.16 *
WVI Security II	.35	.24	.35	.22
WVI Econ. Returns I	.32	.12 *	.29	.13 *
WVI Econ. Returns II	.39	.04 *	.34	.02 *
Surroundings I	-.22	-.19 *	-.18	-.11 *
Surroundings II	-.23	-.12 *	-.19	-.05 *

NOTES: * - not significant

Significance of r:

For Coops. $r = \pm .18 < .05$

$r = \pm .23 < .01$

For Controls $r = \pm .21 < .05$

$r = \pm .26 < .01$

TABLE VII

CORRELATION OF D.A.T. CLERICAL VS. SELECTED VARIABLES

COOP. (N=108)

	Phase I	Phase II
IQ (Phase I)	.26	.33
IQ (Phase II)	.26	.37
WVI Economic Return	.17*	.22

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION OF ENGLISH GRADES VS. SELECTED VARIABLES

COOP. (N=108)

	Phase I	Phase II
Job Evaluation	.26	.16
Attendance Pre.	-.21	-.06*
Attendance Post	-.12*	-.20
Level of Voc. Asp. I	-.07*	-.19

TABLE IX

CORRELATION OF JOB EVALUATION RATING VS. SELECTED VARIABLES

COOP. (N=108)

English (Phase I)	.26
Social Studies (Phase I)	.18
Social Studies (Phase II)	.18
WVI Economic Return	.22
Absence	-.21
Term Average Pre.	.27
Term Average Post	.37
Best Fitted Post	.24
Level Vocational Expectations Pre.	.19
Level Vocational Expectations Post	-.28
Level Education Like Post	.18

---

* Not Significant

Significance of r: $r = \pm .18 < .05$
$r = \pm .23 < .01$

B. Qualitative Data

While the foregoing section was concerned with statistical findings it will be recalled that a considerable volume of data was collected in the form of interviews, questionnaires and observations that were not subjected to statistical treatment. In the following section findings relating to certain selected problems and issues are presented, supporting data being cited as appropriate and additionally available in the appendix F. The findings come under the following headings:

1) Upgrading effects of Municipal Cooperative Educational Program.
2) Attitudes and change in attitudes during Program.
3) Behavior and behavior changes - on the job and in school.
4) The drop-out and retention problem.
5) Personal development, identity and goals.

1) Inasmuch as one basic goal of the Program was to upgrade minority group youngsters it should first be indicated that more than half of the boys in the coop program were in white collar jobs. However, by the same token almost half of them were in blue collar work including Park Department and hospital jobs that carry titles which appear to be more upgrading than is actually the case. Thus, within the 108 coops studied, 40 were Dietetic Aides or Park Department Helpers. The first job classification is frequently a euphemism for kitchen help, the second usually involves dirt picking, with notable exceptions to be explained later. In the course of visiting job installations such as the Botanical Gardens it was found that a vicious circle characterized a good deal of the placement during the 1962-63 Study year. In order to qualify for some of the better jobs certain levels of academic training and achievement appear to be necessary. Inasmuch as many of the young people from the four schools that were studied did not have adequate background, it was not unusual to find that these jobs were then filled from other schools where the socioeconomic level was slightly higher, or where there was not as heavy a concentration of minority ethnic groups. The exact figures are difficult to present without going beyond our study sample. In order to evaluate the attitudes of the Study sample towards the upgrading nature of their jobs, selected statements give the flavor better than statistics. Thus, one boy states that he does not want to continue on a Park Department job "because I want to be something and not break my back the rest of my life." Another boy says, "I don't like to clean the dishwashing machine. You sweat a lot." He continues, "The regular workers expect me to do all

the mopping up. They just sit around." Both boys, however, were satisfied with their pay, felt they had the prestige of a Civil Service job, but didn't know whether they were going to learn anything if they kept on at the same thing. The range of attitudes runs from clear dissatisfaction with any dirty work all the way through tremendous pride in working for the City.

It may be stated that upgrading was frequently more accidental and incidental than planned or purposeful. Basically the boys in the Study group were rather passive and conformist about their assignments, and only a small number was openly hostile or pessimistic about the eventual good as against the immediate financial returns.

2) A second concern of the program was to help develop positive job attitudes that would have transfer value in any job. From the interviews in the fall to those in the spring certain trends did emerge. There was on the whole an increase in generalized positive attitudes toward work. Some rather concrete evidence was found in a qualitative analysis of the Incomplete Sentence Blank section dealing with job attitudes. There tended to be a feeling about such matters as "earning a living" which stressed the difficulty and urgency more at the beginning of the year and optimism and responsibility at the end of the year. Another example is a generalized attitude toward work which was quite positive, "Work is good" or "Work is important" as against a relatively small number who indicated negative attitudes, "Work is hard" or "work is bad". It is important to note that the coops as a group started with generally positive attitudes toward work and that the amount of change was not very great.

On another item which dealt with employers, nearly a third of the responses were negative, "Employers are tough." About a third were neutral, "Employers look for the best people," or "Employers give jobs to lots of people." The positive attitudes toward employers were of two kinds - general, "Employers are very nice people," or - personalized (an unusually large number of responses here), such as "Employers are very kind and considerate to me" or "All employers get along with me," or "Employers at my job are very nice." In general, the changes in attitudes here were remarkably few with a tendency for more positive and more personalized responses at the end of the year.

Interesting exceptions are the change in one boy who on his first response said: "Employers - I get along with." At the end of the year he stated: "Employers - I don't like." Perhaps the most significant aspect of the analysis of attitudes through the Incomplete Sentence Blank was the very great consistency that revealed fairly deep-rooted attitudes. Examples are: Phase I - "Employers try to give you the lowest rate possible." - Phase II: "Employers are cheap with the dough."

A related item dealt with attitudes toward teachers and here the same deep-rooted attitudes were revealed: Phase I - "Teachers are humans!" Phase II - "Teachers are good sometimes!" Phase I - "Teachers are too easy on students!" Phase II - "Teachers should be tougher on students." In general there was no significant change from beginning of the year to the end of the year with nearly a third of the responses both times being somewhat negative, or hostile, or disparaging, with the others ranging from neutral and qualified to very positive.

From the interviews one gets corroborative data about fundamental attitudes toward work, school and authority. Both types of data yield the following generalization: considering the level of social and economic disadvantage and the minority group status of most of the students, one is not confronted with an alienated ideology. Indeed, the attitude system, even at Phase I, was apparently more positive than that of the controls.

3) A third matter of concern was the extent to which changes in behavior, as against attitudes, would result from the Program. Although the statistics in the foregoing section indicate improvement in attendance and a superior attendance record to that of the controls, several additional sources of data suggest that this is not the entire picture. For one thing, lateness on the job and absence on the job could not be compared with any other criterion except for simular behaviors on the part of regular employees. In this regard a pervasive theme, while not a major complaint, continues to be the high rate of absence and lateness on the part of the coop students on the job as compared with regular employees.

As to school behavior, while attendance certainly improved noticeably, there was a tendency for greater rates of absence during school weeks than during work weeks. However, there was uniform agreement on the part of teachers and coordinators that coop students had showed greater improvement in manners, morale and general behavior. To support these observations the interview data reveal a tremendous degree of pride in being a coop and, in fact, this esprit decorps would appear to be one of the outstanding positive developments of the program.

4) The problem of drop-out and potential drop-out, which was at the very heart of the Program's inception, is dealt with at this point rather than in the statistical section simply because of the inconsistent data on this score. It may be stated in general the percentage of those who dropped out of the Program was very low, the number dropped from the Program by agency or school was very low, and those who dropped out of school altogether was also represented by a small number. One reason for the qualitative rather than the quantitative statement made herein is essentially methodological. Thus because of the large turnover in the Study schools, because of the statistical method which classifies actual June drop-outs in the statistics of the following September, because of the drifting from day school to evening school, the

transfer from school to school, the development of comparable statistics for the controls in these schools, one is forced to use statistics that emerge from inspection rather than from hard and fast data. A rough estimate is that the retentive power of the coop program in general was very high, that the numbers who proceeded to graduate from high school was clearly higher than those in the controls; but even here the question of who is an eligible senior for graduation and who is not is extremely ambiguous in the General Course because of the number of students who are not clearly in a given grade.

5) The overall value of any program for young people should be understood in terms of the overall personal growth and development of the students, and hence of identity, goals and horizons. In this general area the following findings are pertinent:

a) Based on interviews as well as Incomplete Sentence Blank, but especially the latter, the coops (as well as the controls) have a very difficult time choosing a career or job. The choice problem is overwhelming and is faced with great trepidation. It is in this light that the actual job placement must be understood. Many of the placements are adequate because they do not violate any preconceived choice, there being no clear choice to start with. However, a number of placements were at odds with the goals and choices or concepts of the students. In general the wishes and choices are not consulted - the actual placement being based on the availability of a job and the availability of a person to fill it.

b) The connection between the job and the school ranges from the remote to the obvious. Some students truly see the value of school once they have begun to work on a job. This is especially true where related training programs are available at the school. However, a significant number of students still see limited value in their school experience perceiving it only as a means to continuing on the Civil Service job. Still others resent being in school and see little value in it as compared to the work experience. Staying in school for a considerable number is not the fulfillment of a goal, but a means to an end.

c) A surprisingly large number of boys acquire goals based on an identity in Civil Service. The basic facts of income, stability, community prestige, motivate them to think in terms of staying with some kind of Civil Service position even if not with their current one. Such goals sometimes result in a desire to continue in school after high school.

d) The positive identifications which are so important for adolescent growth are apparently abetted by the jobs more than by the schools. During the study year frequent mention was made of the friendship and respect conceived for supervisors and some of the older Civil Service employees. It was not unusual to find the young people being given encouragement, help with their homework, special interest in their futures, hints on taking Civil Service examinations, improvement of job skills, etc. This was unquestionably one of the most salutary effects of the Program, combining personal and occupational models in a meaningful relationship.

e) Finally, if personal development were to involve upward mobility, the development of middle-class ideals, then one might say that frequent references to a clean job, a white collar job, a job which was respectable, plans to go on for further schooling (sometimes not realistic, other times quite appropriate), shunning of certain peer group values and acceptance of others -- these were all effects of the program that were most noticeable amongst the boys who worked in offices. However, in the Park Department there were at least several boys who were affected by the same middle class aspirations and standards.

C. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions and recommendations are based on both types of findings reported above. The description of the cooperative students that may be drawn from these findings and the effects of the Program may be summarized under several headings.

1) General Ability. The cooperative students were below average on measured scholastic ability as compared with the general high school population, and thus represent a base line of functioning rarely associated with white collar or Civil Service work. They were in a General course, this representing the lowest level of academic program. The fact that they were able to show a significant rise in measured IQ during a relatively short period raises serious questions about the use of any of these tests as predictors of performance. What is most significant, however, is the fact that so many of them performed on the job as well as they did considering the level of their test scores.

2) Specific Skills. Clerical aptitude, reading and arithmetic skills are more specific than the general scholastic aptitude mentioned above, and here, as might be expected, the cooperative students are considerably below average on grade norms. While they were able to improve in all these areas, the rate of increase was not statistically significant.[1] There is evidence, however, of consistently upward movement even though special teaching or tutoring was not available.

3) Attitudes and Adjustment. The cooperative group may be characterized as being generally well adjusted as compared with the high school norms. Furthermore their attitudes toward work, school and society did not show the kind of alienation often ascribed to lower status disadvantaged minority youth. It should be noted

---

[1] Except for Clerical Aptitude.

again that a General course group is generally a selected sample, that being in the 11th and 12th grades shows a considerable amount of persistence beyond the high drop-out period of the 10th grade, and certain other considerations may have given this sample bias. However, the similarity of the coops and controls was so great that one is forced to conclude that truly alienated, hostile, seriously disadvantaged youth may no longer be in the high school in the 11th grade. In any event, significant changes in attitudes and adjustment did not appear to occur during the study year except in terms of reinforcing stable occupational and educational goals.

4) Behavior and Performance. The coop group started with lower school averages than the controls and improved significantly, in fact, exceeding the controls at the end of the year. Their absence rates were significantly lower than the controls and they showed a distinct decline in behavior subject to disciplinary action. In general they stayed in school more than did the controls, and had a very low drop-out rate as regards the job. There seemed to be a general agreement between job ratings and school performance, but there were considerable instances where there was disagreement. On the whole the capacity of General course students with measured skills, abilities and grades that were, at best, marginal, to perform as adequately as they demonstrated was a significant achievement.

5) Goals and Directions. The coop group as a whole started with limited and modest goals. These were not significantly enhanced as a result of the Program. Inasmuch as goal-setting derives from a lifetime of realistic adaptation, "higher horizons" may take longer to establish than improvement in actual performance. The data here are quite compatible with most studies of lower class youth insofar as they show realistic occupational and educational aspirations with a minimum of fantasy or adventurousness, with a maximum of practicality that makes a Civil Service job ideal. In those cases where goals were high and the fantasies great one may detect signs of immaturity: where occupational aspirations and economical expectations seemed to be lowered during the Study were for the brighter and more able students. One might conclude that the group as a whole had never indulged in the kind of real fantasy that is the basis for highly motivated performance and that it is easier to work with such fantasy in the long run than to be confronted with the excessive pragmatism which is so characteristic of lower class life.

The findings and conclusions presented above lead to several recommendations which are focused primarily on the students:

1) Selection of Students. While not represented as such, it may be understood from the foregoing data that the generalizations obscure considerable heterogeneity. For one thing, selection criteria varied from school to school and ranged from readiness to accept students with serious disciplinary infractions all the way to a concern that only well-behaved boys be included. As will be

seen later in the section on the Program itself, the absence of selection criteria may have made the program more conducive to development for some than for others. One important factor here is a better understanding of the objective skills, the readiness, the aspirations and attitudes of each individual, so as to provide a better diagnostic basis for placement. One important recommendation here is early selection - that is, in the 10th grade before the student is 16 and while he can begin to remediate the deficits which often limit his placeability when he enters the program.

2) Guidance. While this is closely related to the selection problem, it is more comprehensive inasmuch as it concerns the availability of specially trained personnel who can work with the objective data as well as the attitudes and aspirations of the coops and, finally, with the instructors that the students have on the job and in the classroom in order to make appraisal and counseling more than mere phrases. It is recommended that personnel with knowledge of testing, of adolescent personality, with knowledge and understanding of disadvantaged or minority youth be assigned to the cooperative program. If preselection is made before the 11th grade there should be more time for interviewing and individual planning. Furthermore, with a better knowledge of which jobs are likely to be available more careful individualized placements may be made. It is also strongly recommended that group counseling procedures be used to deal with orientation to job requirements. Finally, the ratio of student to coordinators should be low enough to enable the coordinator to determine the relationship between the particular job placement and appropriate educational and curricular experiences.

3) Education and Remediation. These should be aspects of both the job and the school that subsume the foregoing recommendations but, additionally, involve the extension of such remedial efforts that may perhaps most easily be determined in the job setting and forwarded back to the school. The rapidity with which the IQ was accelerated points to the possibility of rapid change when there is planned intervention. The major drawback to many program plans has often been a sense of defeat. The ability of the coop youngster to respond to help has been only minimally tapped.

4) Research. The findings reported above are merely suggestive of the wealth of data on these students that is available in the form of unprocessed interviews and other analyzed data. It is therefore recommended that:

a) Further analysis of the already collected data be performed and treated statistically wherever possible.

b) Plans for follow-up on both the coops and the controls in this sample be developed.

c) Use of research instruments be incorporated into the regular functioning and practice of the program as valuable guides to understanding and as bases for continuing research and practice.

THE MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM:
III. A RE-EXAMINATION OF PREMISES AND POSSIBILITIES

This review of the Program is based primarily on observations, visits, reports and data for the period February, 1962 to January, 1964 but makes use of some later material where appropriate. The concern here is how the findings about the students themselves may be synthesized with observations of the Program to provide a better understanding of the operational and administrative aspects of this major educational effort.

While certain observations, comments and recommendations have previously been transmitted to Dr. Calvin Gross and Dr. Theodore Lang, (see Appendixes G, H and I) it is in order to present them again in the overall context of this report. Furthermore, while some of these points may no longer be valid in detail, they do point up certain problems in developing a work-study program with the unique features of the subject program. Although the present report is based on a sampling of four schools, the degree to which these findings may be extended is more a matter of sensitization to certain basic issues in education than generalizations about the Program.

This section consists of a brief survey of the agencies involved in the Program, their operations, their relationship to each other and their services to the students. Suggestions for program improvement are made in the light of the findings about the students. Finally, hypotheses about the Program are formulated which may be useful in further evaluation and research as well as in program development.

A. The Program as a Whole

The original notion of a council to coordinate the activities of the Board of Education and the Personnel Department included both a professional staff and a board to advise on policy. The Manpower Utilization Council assumed such a role but during the study year a vacuum developed as far as staffing was concerned and the advisory aspects of the Council became non-functional. By January, 1963, it was necessary to find new machinery for policy and liaison between Education and Personnel. (See Appendix E, letter from David Hunter dated February 5, 1963.) Meetings were commenced where Dr. Edward Lewis of Urban League (chairman), Dr. Hopkins of the Board of Education, Mr. Hoberman of Personnel and the present writer attempted to work out problems and policies. These meetings were helpful but were not an adequate substitute for a continual policy-making body with adequate power to implement recommendations. Thus, the meetings were irregular, there were lags in follow-up, fundamental issues arose, were deferred for further information and remained unresolved.

An example was that of "Criteria for Selection" (Appendix J) which remained undefined as of February, 1964. Typical examples involved the Minutes of May 27, 1963 (Appendix K) where several issues continued to drift from meeting to Board of Education and back again and were still being discussed in correspondence between Dr. Hopkins and Mr. Hoberman in late 1963 and early 1964.

In the interim, at a meeting in late October, 1963, Dr. Gross, Dr. Lang and Mr. Hunter of Ford agreed that the Program was viable but needed more liaison and policy-making machinery. It is the present writer's opinion that super-agency control of some kind is necessary and that this can be evolved along lines suggested later, following the separate discussions of Personnel and Education.

B. The Personnel Department and The Municipal Cooperative Education Program

The role of this department in the Program was apparently co-equal to the Board of Education, but there were important distinctions. The youths were selected by the Board but the jobs were provided by Personnel. The youths were all under the jurisdiction of the Board but a significant educational function was being provided by Personnel and the various city departments. These points suggest opportunities and anomalies. To the writer, the difficulties that were apparent in the early period of the Program were understandable because of the tremendous effort by Personnel's field staff to locate jobs, to arrange for placements and to interpret the students to the supervisors. During the Study Year (1962-63) it was apparent that Personnel was doing an excellent job of attempting to perform an educational function for the students but this was limited by "jurisdictional disputes" with the Board of Education personnel. Questions of who might visit or talk with students and school coordinators, and problems of guidance and curriculum arose which resulted in circumscribed functions rather than cooperative planning.

It is most important to state, however, that Personnel developed a number of innovations, programs, and special plans which reflected a desire to fulfill the spirit as well as the letter of a cooperative education program. A discussion with the researcher of the special needs by supervisors to understand disadvantaged and minority youth led to a well-organized and (as of this writing) a continuing series of training workshops of excellent calibre and much follow-up. The zeal of the field staff in communicating these concepts in day-to-day contacts has been demonstrable throughout.

A special newsletter, of excellent quality, has been continually published by Personnel, further indication of the high importance placed on this special program. Special practice tests have been evolved to help students prepare for regular exams; career conferences and job planning under Personnel auspices as well as attempts to feed back curricular suggestions, etc., are also examples of a basic attitude backed up by program. To generalize, it is the writer's opinion that the leadership and staff in Personnel has been education minded, developmental in orientation, humanistic in basic purpose and attitude and, above all, concerned with protecting the youth so that they might indeed find themselves through their jobs without excessive pressure for immediate productivity.

It should be clear, however, that the job themselves are in many municipal agencies so that this discussion needs to consider the Program in its ultimate sense to be that which takes place on the job.

On the basis of the visits as described in Section I above and scrutiny of various reports as well as participation in training programs for supervisors, the following general statements are warranted:

1. From a lack of understanding, reluctance to bother, indifference and hostility on the one hand to enthusiasm, concern and support on the other, supervisors and regular employees in various agencies have held a range of attitudes. The degree to which these attitudes have become generally positive is quite remarkable and is a tribute to all concerned. The genuine interest displayed by some civil service staff has had a marked effect as noted in Section II where these personnel were noted as having become role models and key persons for many students.

2. The problems of budget, examinations and civil service requirements led to a recommendation by the writer that new job specifications be prepared for students (other than "trainee") but he is not aware of the latest developments here. The point, however, is that considerable flexibility has been demonstrated by Civil Service in opening up job situations to students, greater flexibility being achieved more recently. On the other hand, as a body of young people has been appointed permanently upon graduation, certain attrition of opportunities has also been noted.

3. Jobs vary considerably in their up-grading and developmental value. This is, in many ways, the central problem, and the writer on several occasions raised the question of whether increasing the number of jobs for students was as advisable as concentrating on the qualitative nature of the job opportunities. The concern here is that earning money is not enough for many youngsters, that an inappropriate job does

not improve morale or make school more meaningful and, in fact, may reinforce negative attitudes towards both school and work.

4. Finally, whatever the job, the development of the job as an aspect of curriculum has not been achieved because of the minimal coordination on this score. This is also due to the fact that supervision and on-job-training are costly and funds are needed for supervision of large numbers of untrained youth.

To summarize, the need for municipal government to recruit efficient personnel is highly compatible with the objective of upgrading heretofore underdeveloped disadvantaged youth. The propensity to use already-developed youth is understandable but the uniqueness of this program needs to make greater use of the job as a developmental and educational experience and it is this direction which municipal agencies under leadership of Personnel seem to be taking. The question is whether large numbers can be dealt with if efficient supervision (teaching, in effect) is not available.

C. The Board of Education and Its Role

This part of the discussion deals with the most challenging aspects of the Program: selection of students, guidance, placement, curriculum and coordination. The generalizations to be made in these areas may be more helpful as guidelines than as statements of current fact.

1. The early program stages showed a great variety of conceptions of who should be selected for the program. The range of students and schools was considerable and indeed may have contributed to the strength of the program. The question of who is a potential dropout and whether the program should be so considered was an important one but the difference of opinion between Education and Personnel on this score was never clearly resolved. Thus, Personnel was less reluctant to "sell" the students as "potential dropouts" while Education balked at the designation.

2. A related problem was that of ethnic groups and appropriate up-grading of jobs for minority youth. While Negro and Puerto Rican composition was about half by the end of school year 1963, it had gone up to about 85% by the end of school year 1964. While the study year data for the four schools studied showed disproportionate numbers of minority youth in dead-end or marginal jobs, it is quite clear that the problem of unskilled and semi-skilled ghettoes is not easy to resolve. The fact that the Municipal Cooperative Education Program is now largely composed of minority youth poses the possibility of a new type of ghetto in which the private or business Cooperative Education Program will be largely white. Suggestions on this matter and others are given later.

3. Placement on jobs during the study year was in part conditioned by immediate availability rather than by planned placement effort. Thus, it is easy to see how frustrated a school coordinator or a staff member at the Board of Education might be. However, with minimal data about aspirations and interests available, a laboratory job placement, for example, is inappropriate for a youth for whom it means cleaning cages of experimental animals with no other meaning except the pay check. The eagerness of students to please in the interview, the seeming homogeneity (in terms of tests, grades, general course, etc.) of many therefore requires more careful diagnostic and differential analyses.

4. Closely related to the foregoing and perhaps a more inclusive way of dealing with several fundamental issues is the factor of the school coordinator. At the time of the study, the criteria for this assignment were not at all clear, and, in fact, seemed to depend mostly on whether a given teacher would carry the coops for class work in his subject. The variety of skills, understandings and backgrounds was great (as it may well be for effective work) but the knowledge of tests, jobs and cooperative education was usually quite minimal. The individual conferences, the group work and the general guidance activities (selection, orientation, placement, personal support, adaptability) varied too much in depth, meaning and quality. Guidance in its broadest yet in its specialized sense is of utmost importance in this type of program.

5. There appeared to have been only minimal orientation of coordinators to the various problems discussed in the preceeding paragraphs. Administrative rules were clear, but rationale for selection, the special problems of work-study, curriculum adaptation, differential placement, guidance problems were dealt with superficially and this is reflected by the range of role perceptions and role activities presented by coordinators. A great need was apparent as of late 1963 for intensive training of coordinators.

6. One problem was that of field visit activities of school coordinators. Although this should be a vital aspect of such an assignment, the job visitations did not enable coordinators to observe their students on the job. The need to develop appropriate administrative procedures to accomplish such a goal is further pointed up in the next paragraph.

7. Perhaps too many programs were mounted in too many schools. With the shortage of specialized and trained coordinators, the fragmented small programs in a number of schools made for scattered efforts. This led to a variety of procedures for dealing with the subject students when there were but a few in a given school.

8. The opportunity to devise special curricular and remedial programs was largely not seized. Indeed the main value of such a program is to relate jobs to school and to make direct use of work experience in the school and vice versa. Most coordination was administrative and not educational. Interviews with the students, teacher conferences and observations, and job visitations showed only a few situations where curriculum was flexible or where creative teachers had used the fact that the coops were working to "enrich" or improvise meaningful and motivating school experiences. The fact that only limited observations were made in this area does not mitigate the startling observation that this might well be the core of a cooperative education program for disadvantaged, non-academic youth.

9. The point about remediation needs special mention both in the context of the last point and a related one. Educationally disadvantaged youth stimulated by new needs are in the best position for intensive and special remediation. However, little was done to obtain learning needs from job locations and use them. It would appear that remediation at the right moment would bring many youngsters up rather quickly. But perhaps a prior consideration should be the early recruiting, selection, orientation and special preparation as early as the 10th grade. The pool of motivated youngsters would increase and the range of job placements at 11th and 12th grades would do so as well. While a 10th grade program for girl stenographers has been developed in one high school, this excellent approach clearly needs to be expanded widely.

10. A further comment is related to the fact that so many students were placed in the 12th grade. For an experience of this kind to be truly valuable, a two-year placement should be seriously considered. Especially is it a problem now when the job actually starts in late October or November and ends in May or June.

11. It is important to state that the job at the school is in many ways more difficult than at the agencies. Each agency may absorb a small number of students, whereas at the schools studied major modifications in schedule, in planning, in personnel assignment are necessary. The overall commitment by teachers and administrators is fine and the foregoing is concerned with program improvement, not with pointing up deficiencies.

D. Recommendations for Maximum Use of the Possibilities Inherent in Cooperative Education

1. Despite the limited scope of the Study, in sample, time and place, a number of hypotheses about the Municipal Cooperative Education Program may be reformulated and it is recommended that these reformulations be used as bases for further research and evaluation.

a) The Municipal Cooperative Education Program is a better way of conducting education for disadvantaged, unmotivated youth than the traditional school program and increases both motivation and learning.

b) The students in the program are not significantly angry or alienated, or even potentially high dropout students.

c) Hard-core or difficult students, including obvious potential dropouts, are already unreachable by the 11th grade and work-study must start at the 9th grade.

d) The students who do complete cooperative education are better equipped for work than other general course students. A follow-up study could test this.

2. The foregoing hypotheses are a minimal number of fruitful research hypotheses that could be tested. It is not as feasible to formulate hypotheses about the program as such, but recommendations for consideration of further study, research and action are presented.

a) The premise that cooperative education as such must reconsider drastic redefinition of joint teaching responsibilities of job situations and schools. This requires joint curriculum planning and exchange.

b) The personnel who engage in supervision on the job and those who are teacher-coordinators in the school must be specially selected and then given considerable training.

c) Not all agencies or schools can engage in such joint and complex educational efforts: only selected and concentrated school efforts should be used whereas agencies should be used only if orientation and adequate time for training and supervision is available.

d. As for administrative relationships, designated liaison personnel should have free access to both schools and job locations in order to work with the young people concerned. There is a real need for constant feedback, and a separation between job situation, placement activities and school understanding of the youth on the job is not helpful.

e) Selection and orientation and preparation for the Program should begin with the feeding junior high schools. The esprit de corps of 10th graders already specially selected for work should go far towards accomplishing goals which are too often unrealistically expected to be accomplished in an 8 or 9 month period.

f) The proportions of remedial and guidance personnel to work with the pre-selected students should enable group counseling and orientation as well as individual conferences for better placement. It is too much to expect that work and/or a pay check by itself will change motives, aspirations, work habits and learning ability without continuous supportive services.

g) Placements should be made on the basis of extensive individual data and should be seen as part of the curriculum.

h) Placements should start in the 11th grade for all coop students (pre-selected earlier) and should enable more than one placement experience so as to increase the exploratory and try out value of cooperative education. Above all, however, a specific and stipulated program of training needs to be written involving rotation within an agency wherever possible.

i) In view of the shrinking shortages in Civil Service jobs and the increasing competition by adults for the same shortage jobs filled by coop students, eventually the rationale of "shortage" will need to be minimized and municipal agencies will therefore clearly need to provide opportunities for training and development. If this is not made clear then only the least desirable jobs will be used in the program.

j) The greater use of private business coop situations for minority group members should be encouraged or else the Municipal Cooperative Education Program will become entirely Negro and Puerto Rican.

k) New job titles with long range career value should be developed, e.g., dietary aids could be set on the course for Food Service Supervisors which involves two years of college and housekeepers for hospitals are also at the community college level of training. There are other areas which require redesigning jobs and reworking job specifications to permit trainees to look ahead to advancement and opportunity.

l) With considerable data available a great deal of research is feasible and the list of data and materials which are available is appended. (See Appendix L)

SUMMARY

In general, the Municipal Cooperative Education Program is a major step forward in education because of the scope and magnitude of the two public agencies which are cooperating in the development of disadvantaged youth. The opportunity to make this a landmark in education is there but requires the innovation of new roles for teachers, counselors, job supervisors and personnel specialists. The possibility of a new integrated curriculum which frankly states that a job *is* curriculum has likewise not been tapped. The very size of the program may inhibit demonstration and model building but should provide varieties of situations for experimentation as suggested above. The abandonment of job efficiency as a short-run criterion and the substitution of long-run social efficiency are both goals that can be realized in such a program. For successful implementation and because of the unique qualifications and training required for effective work in this complex area, the feasibility of a new academic discipline of cooperative education should be considered. Finally, just as we are relinquishing age-old notions of who can learn and of what work is, so must we move into serious redefinitions of work, school, teaching and efficiency, redrawing lines and boundaries in the interest of solving the vast human problem which gave rise to the Municipal Cooperative Education Program.

APPENDICES

A. Agreement to Conduct Study, February 26, 1962

B. Clarification of Nature and Purpose of Study, May 15, 1962

C. Authorization to Obtain Data in Participating High School, September 12, 1962

D. Design for the Study

E. Letter from Ford Foundation, February 5, 1963

F. Interview Abstracts

G. Letter to Dr. Theodore H. Lang, June 1, 1963

H. Summary Report to Dr. Calvin E. Gross, October 1963

I. Summary Memorandum to Drs. Calvin E. Gross and Theodore H. Lang, October 29, 1963

J. Memorandum on Criteria for Selection

K. Policy Committee Meeting of Manpower Utilization Council, May 27, 1963

L. Data Available for Further Analysis

COPY

February 26, 1962

Mr. O. William Ross
Executive Director
The Manpower Utilization Council
of the City of New York
299 Broadway
New York 7, New York

Dear Mr. Ross:

This memorandum is intended to serve as a contract for the evaluation of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program. As such, the undersigned agree that the evaluation will be in effect from February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1963 and will be renewed on February 1, 1963 to run to January 31, 1964.

It is understood that the purpose of the evaluation is to implement the clause in the Ford Foundation Letter of Grant dated July 24, 1961 calling for an independent evaluation. In that connection, the Manpower Utilization Council's memorandum, dated November 1, 1961, specifies its view of the evaluation as a concurrent appraisal of the program, including continued suggestions for strengthening and improvement. It is agreed that the evaluation will consist of such concurrent study and analysis as well as an evaluation of the outcomes of the Program for the period studied.

The evaluation study is to be carried out by Dr. Martin Hamburger as Director with a staff chosen by him. An Advisory Committee of prominent citizens is to be selected, mutually agreeable to the Manpower Utilization Council and the Evaluators, in order to provide additional perspective on the Program. Insofar as the administration of tests, the arrangement for interviews, or the use of various evaluative instruments are concerned, all arrangements for such study will be made through the Executive Director or the Assistant Director of the Manpower Utilization Council with the understanding that there will be appropriate clearance with the representatives of the Department of Education and the Personnel Department where needed.

It is understood that the evaluators will have access to all records, materials, and personnel involved in the Program, insofar as such records are controlled by the Department of Personnel and are made available by the Department of Education. In a sense, this agreement designates the evaluators as a Study Group involved in data gathering, data appraisal, and continuing feedback to the operating personnel of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program.

The Evaluation Plan

The following concerns itself with the general plan and schedule of the evaluation:

1. The first phase of the evaluation study will run through the spring term, from February to June, 1962, and will be an exploratory and descriptive phase.

2. Phase II is planned to cover the school year, 1962-63, and will involve testing, interviewing and other instruments and methods in which the evaluation emphasis will be on (a) a before-and-after study; and (b) an experimental-versus control-group comparison.

3. The prospectus as given above does not limit Phase I (Spring 1962) to mere exploration, nor does it confine Phase II to measured evaluation.

4. In discharging its mandate, the evaluation team will consider any meaningful data with implications for the total program as worthy of report and discussion at any time when it seems relevant. The formal report schedule will be understood to involve an interim progress report at the end of the spring term, 1962, a further progress report in January, 1963, an end-of-year report in June of 1963, and a final evaluation report in December, 1963.

Fiscal Arrangements

The budget for this program is appended, and it is agreed that it will be administered by Research Survey Associates, Dr. Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Executive Director. The fiscal arrangements for the budget involve monthly payments to Research Survey Associates by the Manpower Utilization Council, beginning on March 1, 1962.

Return of a signed copy of this memorandum to Research Survey Associates will constitute approval of the terms herein.

We look forward to a pleasant relationship with the Council in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Martin Hamburger
Project Director

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.
Executive Director
Research Survey Associates

Read and agreed upon: O. William Ross, Executive Director
Manpower Utilization Council of the
City of New York

COPY

May 15, 1962

Dr. Maurice D. Hopkins
Associate Superintendent of Schools
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

Dear Dr. Hopkins:

This memorandum is intended to clarify the nature and purpose of the Study of the Municipal Cooperative Education Program which I am conducting for the Ford Foundation and the Manpower Utilization Council. Inasmuch as the nature of the Program itself is known to you, the present memorandum focuses on the concurrent Study which is to run through December 1963.

The inception of the present Study lies in the Ford Foundation Letter of Grant dated July 24, 1961 which, in establishing the Program with the Board of Education and the New York City Department of Personnel, stipulated that there be an independent evaluation of the Program. The Manpower Utilization Council memorandum, dated March 1, 1961, specified its view of the evaluation as a concurrent appraisal of the Program. Subsequent discussions established the role of the present writer as Director of this Study and it is in this capacity that I wish to specify what the Study, as distinguished from the Program, hopes to accomplish.

First, the goals and purposes of the Ford Foundation must be borne in mind: to provide part-time employment for low socio-economic groups; "primarily it (the Program) is aimed at keeping young people in school"; to provide these young people with supervised employment as a part of their education, thus improving their work skills and their stability so as to aid them in obtaining later full-time employment.

COPY

With these goals in mind the present Study has been conceived in broad terms to permit a better understanding of the procedures and administrative aspects of the Program, the composition of the students, the effects of the Program on their attitudes, skills and overall development, the nature of the jobs and job experiences provided through the Program, and finally, the relationship of the schools and school experiences to the job situations involved. This approach is essentially descriptive but has certain evaluative aspects to it especially the effects of the Program on the students during the relatively short time period involved in the Study. Because of this limitation in time (the school year from September 1962 to June 1963), the major emphasis of the present Study will be on the description and analysis of the Program rather than on any formal evaluation.

To conduct the Study the methods involved include interviews, tests and other measurements, student records and other data, and direct observations in the several settings. The interviewing will be concerned primarily with understanding the experiences of the students before, during and after their participation in the Cooperative Program. However, interviews with the Board of Education staff of the Cooperative Program, the individual school coordinators, principals, guidance counselors, and teachers are in varying degrees considered essential to the better understanding of the total Program. Wherever possible, it is hoped that parents on a selective basis may also be interviewed. Naturally, interviews with the New York City Department of Personnel staff as well as supervisors in the individual municipal departments are likewise essential. In view of the fact that the total number of students enrolled in the Program at the time of this writing is about 400, it is necessary to indicate that our focus in this Study will be most concerned with a relatively small number of schools and that the total number of students to be interviewed will be considerably less than this number. As for any intensive follow-up with individual students, which would include parent interviews, such special procedures would affect an even smaller number than that.

In addition to the interviews, it is felt that about three hours of testing during the early part of the academic year 1962-63 would be involved, tests to include attitude scales, questionnaires, and several specific measures such as spatial relations tests, mechanical aptitude tests, etc., as appropriate. Several short instruments would need to be

COPY

administered again to a relatively smaller number at the end of the academic year. It is anticipated that the three hours of initial testing would apply to about half of the students in the Program with perhaps an additional hour at the end of the year to half of that group.

In the case of both the interviews and the tests, it is hoped that small numbers of comparable students, a control group, would be available for similar study. Besides the interviews and tests with the students themselves, an analysis of their school records and whatever other data is available from the Cooperative Program will be of inestimable value. This will require access to the school records in keeping with the New York City Board of Education regulations. It is expected also that curricula in the several schools will be studied through observation and discussion.

The foregoing plan involves the initial pilot study during the several months preceding the academic year 1962-63, a major study during the academic year itself and follow-up interviews and data gathering during the summer and fall of 1963. While the plan as presented here has touched on a number of phases of our Study, it is obvious that many details will need to be clarified through additional communication. In this connection, let me thank you for the courtesy and understanding that you and Miss Brennan have shown me, and let me assure you that I shall make every effort to conduct that aspect of the Study which involves the Board of Education and the several high schools, with maximum concern for the welfare of the students, the schools and the staff involved. We shall make every effort to maintain open communication lines at every step of the way. I look forward to a fruitful outcome of our mutual concern.

Cordially,

Martin Hamburger, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Study Project Director
Municipal Cooperative Education
Program

MH:df

COPY

Board of Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn 1, N.Y.
HIGH SCHOOL DIVISION
Telephone: ULster 8-1000

September 12
19 62

To the Principals of the following High Schools:

Benjamin Franklin
Boys'
James Monroe
Morris
Julia Richman
Seward Park
Theodore Roosevelt
New Utrecht
Yorkville
Lafayette
Franklin K. Lane
Bushwick

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Subject: Cooperative Education in Municipal Government

The official approval of the Cooperative Education Program in Municipal Government jointly sponsored by the Board of Education, the Personnel Department of the City of New York, the Manpower Utilization Council and the Ford Foundation which was initiated in September 1961 provides for an Evaluation which will include a consideration of the procedures, administration, composition of students, the effects on their attitudes, skills, and overall development through the Program. Dr. Martin Hamburger, Associate Professor of Education of New York University has been named Study Project Director under a Ford Foundation Grant.

I have authorized Dr. Hamburger to approach you for consideration of the areas listed below and have made certain stipulations with respect to each.

1. Records of cooperative students employed in City Government may be studied under the supervision

2. Individual interviews with cooperative students may be conducted not to exceed one hour in length.
3. Testing and other measurements may be administered to these students by Dr. Hamburger or his representative, not to exceed 3 hours in all, possibly conducted in two sessions arranged at mutually acceptable hours and places. This portion of the study is requested for October 1962, with a follow-up testing of one hour at the end of the school year 1963.
4. Dr. Hamburger is authorized to confer with you, the school coordinator, and any other school personnel to be determined by you.
5. Classroom observation is to be permitted and conferences with these teachers may be held solely to clarify observations and to acquaint evaluators with teacher and pupil relationships. There is no aspect of supervision or pedagogical evaluation in such class visitations.
6. A control group, limited in size, may be chosen by Dr. Hamburger on a basis, completely voluntary with the student and with written parental consent.

May I emphasize that there is an agreement between Dr. Hamburger and myself that there will be no identification of pupils, schools, teachers, or classes by name. The entire study will be conducted on a highly professional plane to study and learn rather than to appraise or compare.

In this spirit, I have agreed to the foregoing visitations by the evaluators to your school at all times subject to your decisions as to the best interests of the students, teachers and general operation of your school. I solicit your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

MAURICE D. HOPKINS
Acting Associate
Superintendent

MDH:GD:ac

DESIGN FOR EVALUATION STUDY OF THE MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EVALUATION PROGRAM

I OVERALL DESIGN

The purpose of the Study is to understand better the nature of a work-study program as it affects the behavior, attitudes and development of disadvantaged youth. As such the Study is in part descriptive, of the subjects, the schools, the jobs and the Program. In part, however, it is analytical and evaluative insofar as changes of various kinds will be examined in relation to certain sets of variables. The major focus will be on knowing what school and work mean in the lives of Negro and Puerto Rican high school boys and how their attitudes toward society and themselves are related to their performance and achievement. The assumption of the Program itself is that modifying the school curriculum, and the provision of paid work should have salutary effects. Modifying the opportunity structure, especially would appear to be the crucial experimental experience and its effects need to be understood vis a vis intellectual, academic, emotional and other kinds of development.

The phenomenology of the youths themselves, comparisons with students of similar background but not in the cooperative program, the perceptions of work supervisors and teachers -- all are intended to provide some basis for understanding the attitudes of the several types of participants. But the actual behavioral changes, in school and on the job are to be studied along with the attitudinal patterns. The basic intent, then, is to provide data for further planning for appropriate educational and occupational experiences for marginal and disadvantaged youth.

II METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The Study will concentrate on four schools containing the largest numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican youth but will be supplemented by comparisons at several other schools. In each of the Study Schools, Benjamin Franklin, Boys, Seward Park, and Morris High Schools, interviews with principals, guidance directors, and coop coordinators are to be conducted, and eventually with teachers. Interviews with the boys and some girls in each of these schools. Testing program for all MCEP students as well as for suitable control group. Additional interviews for small numbers of control students. All this to be completed by January 1963.

Field visits to follow at major work establishments. Interviews with supervisors, Job evaluation and study of training. Simultaneous visits at schools for analysis of curriculum experience. Interviews with field supervisors of the City Personnel Department and with the Board of Education staff. Records of school, jobs and other performances will be obtained along with additional data as outlined below.

Copy

The data-gathering will be done in two main phases: in the fall semester (as early as possible) and as close to the end of the school year as possible.

III INSTRUMENTS

In addition to the data to be obtained from regular records; the Study will administer a Work Values Inventory, an Incomplete Sentences Blank, and a Life Planning Questionnaire -- all these designed to tap attitudes and aspirations. Tape recorded interviews will cover the same area; but with opportunity for elaboration. Special concern in the interview will be with the job, its meaning, and its effects.

Additional testing will be Stanford Achievement Reading and Arithmetic, the Otis Gamma, and the Differential Aptitude Clerical Test, (all tests with special relevance to Civil Service and white collar work as well as general academic development.) These to be administered before and after as will all other instruments and interviews.

IV ANALYSIS OF DATA

The essential purpose of describing the students, their characteristics, their perceptions, their experience, their performance and their changes should be achieved by the Data being gathered. Several forms of statisical and thematic analysis are to be made and need not be elaborated here. However, it is clear that before-after, experimental-control, various intra-group and other analyses can be done in different ways.

V POSSIBLE OUTCOMES, RECOMMENDATIONS, ACTIONS

Along with the actual data-gathering and provision of a description of the program, the students, the personnel, there will be periodic communications concerning the way in which the program is operating and as available information will be provided from the Study to appropriate personnel. However, while the long-range Study (in terms of data gathered) seems clearest as to its goal and purpose, it is the concurrent feedback process that is most tenuous and that needs to be specified in greater detail.

Copy

THE FORD FOUNDATION
477 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

February 5, 1963

Dr. Theodore Lang
New York City Department of Personnel
299 Broadway
New York, New York

Miss Grace Brennan
Administrative Director
Cooperative Education
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

Professor Martin Hamburger
School of Education
New York University
Washington Square
New York 3, New York

Dear Messrs. Lang, Hamburger and Miss Brennan:

This is a somewhat tardy expression of my appreciation to you and Messrs. Ferris and Hopkins for taking the time to meet with us to discuss the cooperative education program to which we are contributing.

At the outset, may I indulge in a candid comment on a matter which I suspect is in the minds of some of the participants in that discussion. That is that I would like to assure all that nobody was attacking anybody else. If some remarks were piercing and points were made persistently, it was because of our earnest desire that this program produce the maximum we all hope for in terms of new knowledge and guidance for new approaches to the vexing youth problems with which we are all faced. I believe this is the position of all of us and that what may have appeared to be basic disagreements were, in fact, differences in emphasis.

Copy

Even though we never get to spend the time we would like to in closer touch with the program, I am sure the importance the Foundation attaches to this program is obvious. Because of our inability to keep in constant touch, when we do manage to get together, we may seem like over-eager beavers.

I believe the arrangement for regular monthly meetings in the future among Board of Education, New York City Personnel Director's Office, and researcher should facilitate the entire process of current program review. This should enable continuing assessment of strengths and weaknesses, consideration of desirable modifications indicated by experience, etc. The possibility of extending the program to state government which has arisen since our meeting is precisely the type of decision which can be carefully considered at these meetings.

Likewise, those meetings will reinforce the common determination clearly to define and firmly to adhere to the objective of the program. I believe there is no disagreement that the objective is correctly stated to be to learn under what conditions, for what type of youngsters, in what kind of placements does a combined work experience and educational program help to keep potential drop-outs in school and make the school experience most productive.

Also, this systematic exchange of views and information will nourish a continuing policy development which takes full account of the operational requirements of the Board of Education and the municipal government in harmonious balance with the research needs to insure "quality control" so that the experiment can in fact be evaluated. If the experiment cannot be adequately evaluated, there is no justification for a Ford Foundation grant since the purpose of such a grant can never be merely to finance a supplementary service in the city of New York.

It seems to me that our discussion indicated that the objective of the experimental program is understood and accepted by all, and that the institution of regular monthly meetings among the three participants - school, city government, and researchers - will facilitate the common effort.

If any of the parties feel that there remain any unresolved or unresolvable issues, we would welcome further discussion.

Sincerely yours,

David R. Hunter

INTERVIEW ABSTRACTS

SUBJECT: GL 11/2/62 Initial Interview

1. S: The program requires more studying, but it's good for the individual to study more.

2. S: Talked over coop with parents. They decided whatever I want to do is okay. I have to lead my own life.

3. S: When I first got to job I saw fellows I knew and then felt at ease, not nervous.

4. S: If I should go to college at least I have a substantial job, could advance - not hard. Makes me feel secure.

5. S: Why should I go to high school to just become a hand laborer?

6. S: When I get out of high school parents want me to have a good job - I mean one at a desk - not one where your muscles are aching all the time.

7. S: When grocery clerk, I wondered, "Man, will I be doing this the rest of my life?" So you try to better yourself up, study more.

8. S: Parents want you to be somebody important cause they weren't. Mother had to quit school in 11th grade. Mother depending on me to become something - not just any old hand worker.

9. S: If my work is good, the supervisor will shift me to the closed files.

10. S: In closed files people don't come down there that much. I could also take medical calls, do other things.

11. S: File clerking not monotonous but it is very routine.

12. S: In closed file, gives you time to study in leisure time (for civil service exam), read up on things.

13. S: I think I handle the work pretty good. I try to concentrate on not making any errors.

14. S: Not entirely happy with just filing. Want to learn something else - anything.

15. S: The thing I like best about the job is the people - nice to you - alternate buying coffee - not split in little groups - everybody seems to be together.

16. S: If anyone doesn't seem to want me, I feel pretty hurt.

17. S: Like least - not learning enough.

18. S: Like to get knowledge from a job - learn - also opportunity to get ahead. A con tinuous thing - the more you learn, the more you want to know, the more you want to learn . Always have to explore, attend meetings, get out on own.

19. S: You may not be able to draw well, but if you're active, have creative mind, you'll get ahead.

20. S: Don't do things halfway. If you're going to do it, do it right or not at all.

21. S: Nobody's going to give you a position. You have to work hard and get it yourself.

22. S: It's satisfying to try, cause when you accomplish it you feel like you accomplish this. It took me to do it - I got here first - then can move on.

23. S: By getting coop job it brought me up, have lots of recognition. My mother is proud of me - good to have job with city.

24. S: Makes you feel good to hear, "Such a young boy and he's with a big city organization - must have some intelligence." When you hear that it makes you feel better and that they think you're smart.

24. S: When working in grocery, people say anybody can do that - doesn't take pretty intelligent person.

25. S: When grocery boy, would walk home tired, muscles sore, not caring what I do when I get home. Now feel better when home. Take off white shirt and feel better. It's a better job - and the money, too, that helps out some - helps the family.

26. S: Would have preferred art job, but I don't think there are any with city.

27. S: When I paint, have people model for me - don't do it by self.

28. S: If I study and explore, I get to be commercial artist.

29. S: If I can't go to college, go in evening so I know I'm bettering myself.

30. S: When I get depressed, it's mostly my art. When proportions not right I sit up all night. Want painting to be perfect before I go to bed.

INTERVIEW ABSTRACTS

SUBJECT: NT Initial Interview, 2/5/63

1. I: How feel about things you do?
S: I don't usually like them because sometimes they get hard.

2. I: What like best about the job?
S: I don't usually like all of it but some parts that are good. Can't tell what I like. I like everything.
I: (Q)
S: Moping? I usually do like that.

3. S: Best thing I like about job - put the trays in the machine and then stack 'em up. I like that - it's the easiest.

4. S: I don't like to clean dishwashing machine - sweat a lot.

5. S: She (supervisor) probably thinks I'm good (worker) because I do all my work there.

6. I: How do you feel you handle work?
S: I do everything okay. I can handle my work.
I: (Q)
S: Very good. Usually do more work than workers in there.

7. I: What did you think when you found out you were in the coop program?
S: I was happy about it.

8. I: Why did you want to get into the coop program?
S: Because I have an opportunity now. I work and I'm in school and I could get more experience when I go out to get my future job.

9. S: I wanted to be trained for something. When I go for job, I know what I'm good for.

10. S: (Had wanted to be a clerk (in coop) and had choice between lunchroom and Dept. of Welfare, but welfare job closed down.)

11. I: How do you feel about this kind of work now?
S: I'm used to it now. It's okay. I like it.
I: You still would be interested in being a clerk?
S: Yes, I would.

12. I: Feel could get higher marks?
S: Yes.

13. I: Do you think school is a pretty good thing or would you rather have your diploma now?
S: Yes (nOw).
I: Why?
S: Want to see how I make out on future job.

14. I: Do you think parents should help a boy choose a career?
S: Well, it's up to the boy. It's up to what he wants to do.

15. I: Why does father think clerk is good job?
S: Because of the place and the hours - don't have long hours, no overtime.

16. I: How do you feel about office work compared to factory work?
S: Factory - you have to be running up and down doing a lot of work. Office - you just sit in a chair; you're typing, paper work.

17. I: What are some of the reasons that other people work?
S: Want to make a living. Want to support their family.

18. I: What will you do with a lot of money?
S: First I'd think about getting out of college, getting me a good job. Then after I'd think of buying me a house, everything I wanted.
I: What would you do if you didn't have to worry about working?
S: I'd retire - visit different countries.

INTERVIEW ABSTRACTS

SUBJECT: JM Initial Interview, 2/5/63

1. I: How do you feel about the job?
   S: I really like it. I like the people I'm working with. It's interesting - conversations I get into on the phone.

2. I: How do you feel about the way you handle the work?
   S: I think I handle it pretty well according to the time I've been there ... average worker.

3. S: If I were getting more pay it's a real nice job.

4. S: The kind of job I like where I could learn different things each day.

5. I: What do you think about your earnings?
   S: I think they're rather ... neat ... in terms of the work(he does.)

6. S: (Feels good not having to ask mother for money.)

7. S: I think school will help me improve my life in the future.

8. S: I feel I'm getting the courses that I want but feel I'm getting some that I don't want. Hygiene ... music appreciation.

9. I: What do you think about school in general?
   S: I think it's nice. It actually teaches you how to get along with people - some of the types of people you'll be in contact with.

10. I: What is a good job?
    S: I think any job is good if you like the conditions you working in, if you like the people, and if you like the work that you're doing.

11. I: What interests you about business? What do you like about it?

    S: It's a clean job.
    I: (Q)
    S: It's not a job of using your muscles, just using your head, and you're learning something mostly everyday - learning new things.

12. S: Factory work? I don't think I'd like it.
    I: Why not?
    S: It's dangerous - a hazardous place to work.

INTERVIEW ABSTRACTS

SUBJECT: VL - Initial Interview 11/6/62

1. I: What does OPD mean?
   S: To tell you the truth, I never did learn it.

2. I: Is this much like what you thought work would be like?
   S: Yes, but this is much easier than I thought it would be.
   I: Why?
   S: Other work - people seem to be complaining. I don't have nothing to complain about this job.

3. I: What do people complain about?
   S: They don't sit down - walking all the time - never satisfied what their reactions are.

4. I: Do you talk to supervisor about how things are going?
   S: No, I haven't talked to her. She always seems to be busy.
   I: Do you think she gives you enough help?
   S: See we have an asst. supervisor who gives us all the help.

5. S: I like to be doing something (on job).
   I: You don't like to have time on your hands?
   S: No, doing nothin - like to be doing somethin - because that's what you're there for - to work.
   I: You like to work?
   S: Yeah, I like to work (laughs).

6. I: What's so important to have work to do?
   S: To keep my mind occupied - I got a lot of girls on my back, they keep bothering me. I like to have something to do to keep them off my mind.

7. I: How'd you feel you were prepared for this kind of work?
   S: I didn't exactly know - because I never worked for any Civil Service job like this before and I didn't really know how it would be until I got started in it.

8. I: How come you got into this particular kind of job?
   S: When we got the job - people downtown, they picked out the jobs for us - nobody requested any type of job. I guess they picked out jobs they felt we were best suited for.

9. I: Do you think you're best suited for office job, as compared to a job outside?
   S: I think so.
   I: Would you prefer an office job?
   S: Yes.
   I: Why?
   S: The park jobs you have to be out in the winter time, they cold and stuff. Office job, you'd be inside all the time where it's nice, warm, comfortable.

10. S: It's a better feeling to work in an office. Family, friends - you can tell them you work in an office not on the outside in the Park. Park jobs allright - but I wouldn't want to be working out in the cold in the wintertime.

11. S: It seems like a higher kind of job to be in an office - but it doesn't really because the Parks Dept. pays just as much as an office job. Pays more - because boy who works in the Parks Dept. he gets more money than we do.

12. I: Do you feel it's a higher type of a job? Yeah, uh huh.

13. S: Prefers office work to farm work. Doesn't think nobody wants to work on a farm.
I: Why is this - compared to an office?
S: It's hard work - almost 10-12 hours a day.

14. S: Some of them (Drs.) give you a hard time over the phone but you can't say nothing to them - These foreign Drs., they can't understand me and I can't understand them. They getting on me and I should be the one getting on them.
I: Do you?
S: No.
I: Why not?
S: They come from a foreign country - They can't help it, I guess. The way they speak.

15. I: They (family) think it's a better kind of job?
S: Yeah.
I: Why?
S: I don't know - that's what they always wanted me to do - because they never got the chance to get into this kind of work and they want this for me, I guess.

16. I: (Friends seem to envy his going to work with a white shirt and tie).

17. I: What do you do with the money?
S: Well now, I'm saving. Later on I might want to go to college at night. Sending my mother some - every now and then (in N. Carolina).

18. I: Do you think in future money is going to be the most important thing in a job?
S: Yes, especially if I'm going to want to start a family.

19. I: What's so appealing about the welfare job?
S: The people - you get to know about the people and how their lives are - how they get to be pushed around and they are pushed around in the Dept. Welfare ...... This is not one of the interesting things; this is one of the things which happens to occur.

20. S: I really would want to go higher and higher (on job).

SUBJECT: VL - Initial Interview 11/6/62

21: I: Are you making plans to go higher and higher?
S: As soon as I can take the test - Civil Service - I want to go higher.
I: Think you may stay in the Civil Service:
S: Yes, um hum. Then again if I can get high enough, I want to get into the Fed. Govt.
Because they pay good and they have good opportunities to do things.

22: I: Have you been doing much investigating of these possibilities (w/Fed. Govt)?
S: Yes - read a couple of pamphlets and books and stuff like that. You can do it. If you try real hard - you can do it.

23: S: Don't discuss plans for future with parents. Keep it to myself. They probably know what I want to do anyway - that I want to stay with welfare.

24. S: I think about the future real awful, but I never think about what kind of man I'm going to be.
I: (Q)
S: Well, I think about the plans I want like office work, Police Dept. I think whether I could make it or not or whether I'll stay down like a telephone clerk.

25. S: Here (New York) going to school have a chance to be something. Down there (North Carolina) couldn't be nothing if you graduate from school.

26. I: Do you feel any differently about self since been on the job?
S: Well, I have money in my pocket all the time. Before I didn't have any - bought clothes and stuff myself.

27. I: Why other people work?
S: Forced to work because they have to eat, support their family. If didn't go to school have to work even if don't like their job - nothing better.

INTERVIEW ABSTRACTS

SUBJECT: VL - Follow-up Interview, 5/18/63

1. I: When he first told you about coop program, what you think of it?

   S: It sounded nice - making money and going to school, too - especially being out of school a week - like a vacation out of school.

2. I: Were you disappointed getting this job?

   S: No, I wasn't disappointed. It was kinda nice getting a job where you're starting a future for yourself. Benefits of civil service, vacations, sick leave, and everything. Couldn't find a better one.

3. S: I wanted to be a policeman. If I couldn't do that I'd want to be in a civil service job because it's nice. I'll probably be drafted in the service soon.

4. I: Has money made any difference?

   S: No, because I've been putting it in the bank, sending my mother some because she lives in North Carolina.

5. S: Saving money to get my own home. Can't know if I'll be able to get it, but I hope to get it by the time I'm 25.

   I: (Q)

   S: Why? Just to say something to call your own, I guess.

6. I: Since you've been in the coop has it had any effect on your life during the past year?

   S: It hasn't bothered me. Since I been in coop my grades are better. I don't know why.

7. I: Coop good opportunity?

   S: Yes, gives you a chance to make something better out of yourself. If I was still in school now, I'd have to go out and look for a job. In coop I take exam and probably never have to leave my job.

8. I: What's he think is a good job?

   S: He thinks a job like I got now - sitting in an office.

9. I: In what way does your being a Negro affect your thinking about the future?

   S: I don't think it affects me much bedause - It'd be different if I were in North Carolina, but in New York City you have just as much chance as the other fellow has.

10. I: How you going to get all this? (30 years old)
    S: Going to school - going to night school, 2/3 years.
    Then go to day school and take up some professional course.
    Wouldn't take long.

11. I: Why do people work?
    S: In order to better their lives - make a good living.
    I: You?
    S: I feel happier when I'm working rather than staying around
    the house. Just the way you feel when you're working -
    not the money or anything.

12. I: Difference between you now and before coop?
    S: Just about same - only difference is you home later when
    you work.
    I: (Q)
    S: Yes, I'm happier now. At least I have money to spend, take
    my girl out on the weekend. Now I have my own money to
    do as I want.

    I can't see where coop affects your life at all - just
    leads you to a future to look forward to.

Copy

June 1, 1963

Dr. Theodore H. Lang
Personnel Director
New York City Department of Personnel
299 Broadway
New York 7, New York

Dear Dr. Lang:

I am writing at this time in order to assure that all of us who are concerned with the future development of the Municipal Cooperative Educational Program have an opportunity to review several salient problems. Although I am preparing a detailed progress report on my study, which should be in your hands before the end of June, it seems to me that certain policy issues require fairly immediate attention. Thus, even at the meetings of the Policy Committee, which was developed on the heels of our January meeting at the Ford Foundation, it has not been possible to obtain complete clarification of the ways in which the Ford Foundation funds have been used by the Board of Education. As a result, despite my access to all records and personnel, it has not been possible for me to determine whether more funds could not be available for additional guidance, remedial work, curriculum revision, etc.

While I have had excellent cooperation from all concerned in the Department of Personnel and in the Board of Education, and while we are certainly improving communications up and down the line, there still remain such questions as the extent to which something very special needs to be done for the young people enrolled in this program. In view of the fact that my study is to be completed next fall, it is not at all premature, I believe, for the Superintendent of Schools, Mr. David Hunter of the Ford Foundation, you, and myself to meet in order to consider some rather basic problems rather than detailed administrative and operational matters.

I believe that the new Superintendent, Dr. Calvin Gross, is vitally interested in this program, and I also believe that only the highest level of concern can help to bring about the more

Copy

fundamental changes that both you and I know should eventually be made. I would like an opportunity to discuss this with you further if you think that should be necessary before such a meeting is arranged.

Cordially,

Martin Hamburger, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Study Project Director,
Municipal Cooperative Educational Program

MH/jf

Copy

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Calvin E. Gross, Superintendent of Schools
Board of Education of the City of New York

From: Dr. Martin Hamburger, Associate Professor of Education,
New York University
Study Project Director

Subject: Summary Report on Municipal Cooperative Education Program,
October, 1963

The present summary report is being submitted without the detailed statistical analysis which I had hoped would be ready by this time. Despite this fact, I am taking this opportunity to present some rather specific recommendations for future program development. Please note both the report and the recommendations are limited by the fact that I have concentrated on four specially selected schools, a small number of municipal agencies and that I have made but a small number of classroom observations. The basic sources for my report come from extensive interviews with over 200 students as well as from data provided to me by Board of Education personnel, Civil Service personnel and my staff. Despite differences of opinion about the Program I have found among these sources an internal consistency emerging which is the real foundation for this report.

Let me start with an overall appraisal of the Program to date: Perhaps the major focus of this memorandum might well be to clarify the fundamental issues that brought the Program into being and that need to be reformulated in order to move into the next phase.

The original notion was that something special and different needed to be done for lower socio-economic youth and especially for the minority groups whose occupational horizons were seriously limited. Not only was their occupational spectrum narrow but the persistently high drop-out rate made even school preparation a relatively meaningless method of expanding the spectrum. Thus, in a time when higher levels of education and skill were needed, in a time when serious shortages of skilled personnel were growing rather than diminishing and at a time when opportunities for minority groups were being enlarged, a standstill was apparent insofar as minority youth was concerned.

The inception of this program was, therefore, primarily due to concern over drop-outs who were likely to have dead end careers but at the same time it fell into a larger pattern of utilizing minority groups more effectively in the total labor market. The final consideration that made the Program possible was that the City of New York continued to experience serious shortages of personnel in a number of categories. Thus, a Cooperative Education Program jointly sponsored by the New York City Department of Personnel and the Board of Education would simultaneously contribute to the amelioration of several problems. Any evaluation of this Program needs to harken back to those original objectives and goals.

Although these goals have served as a beacon for the Program, there are three major factors which have affected the implementation of these goals. These are, respectively, 1) The administrative structure of the Program, 2) The policies and standards of the New York City Department of Personnel and, 3) The ongoing program and structure of the Board of Education. Inasmuch as the nature of the two last-mentioned agencies was not especially geared to developing the unique program needed for the task at hand, the necessity for a new organization of personnel and facilities was needed. However, whether the new organizational structure has been under the Manpower Utilization Council or under the Cooperative Education Program of the Board of Education, there appears to have been a division and diffusion of efforts so that the best possible program has not yet evolved. There has not been any centralized authority or leadership for the total Program so as to insure that the pioneering objectives were to be attained.

The actual achievements of the Program to date may be evaluated with two kinds of criteria in mind: 1) The extent to which progress toward the objectives has been made within the existing structure and, 2) The extent to which long range program development requires a basic shift in method.

A summary of the Program's achievements would reveal the following basic facts:

1) As of June, 1963, 39 New York City agencies were participating in the program.

2) 674 trainees filling 337 jobs were employed in 16 different job titles.

3) Broken down into further categories, the trainees involved in the Program were about 55% boys and the combined percentage of Negro and Puerto Rican youth was about 60%.

4) The holding power of the Program was such as to justify the basic hope that the drop-out rate for the trainees was significantly smaller than for a controlled group.

5) There is a range of estimates as to how many young people actually develop a career in civil service upon graduation but, it would appear that a significant proportion do so.

6) Curricular adaptations have been made in several schools to provide special training for civil service; the extent to which

special training has been given on the job is not as clear but ranges from some superior training to nil.

7) Opportunities for further job development are simultaneously expanding and shrinking; the eventual objective of 1000 trainees does not seem likely to be met but, the development of significant breakthroughs for certain high-skill categories is most encouraging.

8) Morale of students by and large is excellent.

9) The growing concern and interest on the part of civil service supervisors and personnel is testimony to the impact the Program has had in the agencies.

The foregoing list of achievements is minimal and obscures a great amount of individual progress which summary data cannot reveal. However, these data also obscure problems and failures which need to be stated equally clearly. If we focus on the boys in the Program, more specifically minority group boys, then overall figures need to be questioned sharply.

1) Thus, the most skilled and most up-grading jobs may well be those filled by girls.

2) It would appear that certain job categories which are least likely to result in up-grading such as Dietary Aid, Laroratory Helper, Seasonal Housing Caretaker, School Lunch Helper and, Seasonal Park Helper, are most heavily filled by Negro and Puerto Rican boys. While Seasonal Park Helper has lent itself to some training, the question emerges as to the extent to which these various job titles may be up-grading for anyone let alone the special group of Negro and Puerto Rican youth. Thus, using February, 1963 data, a total of 11 School Lunch Helpers, 10 Laboratory Helpers, 36 Dietary Aids and 40 Park Department Helpers yields a total of approximately 100 Boys in the jobs which I would consider minimally up-grading. The proportion of minority group youth in at least one category, Dietary Aid, which holds 36 boys, makes the point: most of them were from minority groups.

3) Significant changes in curricula have been made but they have not been based on as much conscious and planned coordination between job and school as is possible. This is so despite the special training for nurses aids, special courses in civil service and, more recently, in connection with the Botanical Gardens program.

4) In a large number of cases, job supervisors did not know about the Program until the day the boys arrived for work. This has been largely corrected.

5) A number of school coordinators did not have common criteria for selection and were proceeding on their own highly divergent understanding of the Program. (A special memorandum on this problem is attached.)

Copy

6) Students' aspirations, special interests and motivations were often not considered in the selection and placement on the actual jobs. Thus, the best that could be said of many such placements is that some trainees received important income but, as such, this could only have temporary rather than educational effects.

7) The highly complex structure of the Personnel and Education departments resulted in a considerable number of instances where no one from the school had ever been to a given job location, there had been no orientation of actual supervisors as to the needs or backgrounds of the trainees and, there had certainly been no coordination to speak of among all those concerned with the problem.

With the above in mind, I would make one of the very first questions to be considered in a review of the Program the matter of numbers -- might not the original objective of 1000 students need to be revised in order to do a more effective job of training and supervising a more manageable number of young people. While this is a fundamental question, let me proceed to recommend several changes in the Program which I consider to be highly essential to its continuing success.

1) A more intensive coordination between the school and the job such as is not easily achieved now in the Program.

2) A program of pre-training in the tenth grade to prepare a larger number of youngsters who could qualify by the eleventh or twelfth grade for the Municipal Cooperative Education Program. Similarly, an upward extension to graduates is recommended so as to provide support and follow-up rather than discharge into the community.

3) More remedial work paralleling the Program.

4) More on-the-job training and supervision, especially insofar as it requires feedback to the schools so that curricular experiences can be linked to the job.

5) Special training of the job supervisors to understand better the needs and backgrounds of the youngsters.

6) Special assignment and training for the school coordinators so that they may do more individualized selection and placement with the students under consideration.

7) Of a somewhat different nature from the foregoing, it is recommended that a consultant be obtained to develop an administrative procedure to deal with the highly complex matter of coordination and feedback as it affects the students, the individual schools, the Board of Education, the City Personnel Department and the various City departments where the job themselves exist.

Copy

The basic question, as I see it is: Shall the Municipal Cooperative Education Program continue to develop as a modification of the very excellent Cooperative Education Program of the Board of Education or should it concentrate on experimentation and on evolving a significantly different work-study program so as to find truly new ways of coping with the problems for which there are no appropriate models at this point.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Hamburger, PH.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Study Project Director,
Municipal Cooperative Education Program

Copy

October 29, 1963

Memorandum to: Dr. Calvin E. Gross
Superintendent of Schools
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn 1, New York

Dr. Theodore H. Lang
Personnel Director
New York City Department of Personnel
299 Broadway
New York 7, New York

In accordance with the agreement reached at our meeting on October 28th, I am submitting a summary memorandum on the Municipal Cooperative Education Program. Hopefully, this statement of recommendations on policy and program will be helpful in the preparation of a joint submittal by the Board of Education and the Department of Personnel to the Ford Foundation.

The overall appraisal of the program to date is so overwhelmingly positive that the recommendations which follow should be understood as focusing on areas of future planning rather than on operational details or past problems. The central issue that needs to be addressed is the extent to which the program has been effective and can be effective not only with lower socioeconomic youth but more specifically with minority group youth. Current data show that the program has been most successful with moderately disadvantaged youth with a moderate degree of academic deficit, but that a combination of standards on the part of the Department of Personnel and adherence to these standards by the Board of Education have militated against a deeper impact on the more seriously disadvantaged minority youth. In order to make a real impact here, it is therefore recommended that a number of steps be taken to make this possible:

Copy

(1) Attention must be given to the specific job titles now being occupied by a large number of minority group boys where opportunity for up-grading seems to be minimal. This may involve a revision of the jobs themselves, additional training, or a different kind of selection process at the outset.

(2) Perhaps the total number of students (the original objective of 1,600) needs to be reconsidered so as to make the problem of supervision, cooperation, and training more manageable.

(3) To insure more effective coordination - between school and job, between the Board of Education and the Department of Personnel, between the Department of Personnel and various agencies - a consultant might well be retained to develop an administrative procedure to deal with the complex problems of coordination and feedback. At present the administration and organization of the program is rather diffuse, and significant gaps occur at most points which require articulation.

(4) There is already in process a considerable increase in the training of the job supervisors to understand better the special needs and backgrounds of the youngsters involved. Every effort needs to be made to enlarge this crucial feature of the overall program.

(5) The scope of the program should extend downward to the 10th grade so as to provide pre-training and greater readiness to make use of the cooperative work experience in the 11th or 12th grades. Earlier identification and preparation would minimize the number of unqualified youth which currently perpetuates the very problem which this program was intended to deal with. It is also recommended that there be an extension upward to graduates so as to deal with a somewhat different problem, namely, raising aspirations by the time of graduation and then providing no support or follow-up at this crucial point.

(6) In order to deal with the significant deficit of many trainees, which is not being bridged either on the job or in the regular curriculum, it is urgently recommended that a considerable increase in remedial work be provided. A corollary to such remediation and enrichment might well be a significant revision of the actual curricular experiences so that they make maximum use of the job experience in the educational program.

(7) It is recommended that more specialized training for school coordinators be planned so that the selection, placement, and coordinative functions may become more individualized.

This memorandum is concerned with the cutting edge of program development and as such is concerned with evolving new methods commensurate with the growing rather than diminishing number of young people who will be affected.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Hamburger, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Study Project Director,
Municipal Cooperative Education Program

MH/jf

Copy

MANPOWER UTILIZATION COUNCIL

MUNICIPAL COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Memorandum on: CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

Dr. Martin Hamburger, Director of Evaluation Study

A. Basically, the concern should be with:

1. Low socio-economic status
2. Minority group membership
3. Potential drop-out
4. Any combination of these factors

B. Specifically, eligibility will be based on:

1. Economic Need
   - (a) Families on public assistance rolls
   - (b) Other evidence of low income or occupational status (to be defined)
   - (c) Children eligible for Hot-Lunch program
   - (d) Room occupancy ratio

2. Social Status

   - (a) Low occupational and educational attainment
   - (b) Negro and Puerto Rican students who otherwise manifest disadvantaged status
   - (c) Slum and related environmental conditions

3. Other Symptoms and Signs of Disadvantage

   (a) Likelihood of early school leaving such as:

   - regression in scholarship from early grades
   - regression in attendance
   - frequent school transfers
   - low interest in school work
   - grade failures
   - reading level (?)

   (b) Other attitudinal and behavioral characteristics

   - hostility toward school
   - acting-out behavior (other than a) above
   - alienation from school and society

Copy

C. Three major types of students should be selected;

1. First and foremost, the basic consideration will be potential for meeting the requirement of a fair day's work. Adaptibility and productivity must be evident.

   (a) Skill requirements where necessary
   (b) Indication of interest and aspiration in a related field of placement
   (c) Grooming and appearance can be readily adjusted
   (d) Personality such as would not likely induce problems
   (e) General potential for upgrading
   (f) Fairly evident trainability

2. Secondly, an important group would be those who do not have all the requisite characteristics, especially insofar as they may need longer periods of training to function at an acceptable level.

3. Thirdly, a small select group who need more orientation, help at the school, preparation, and selective, sympathetic supervision on the job.

Copy

MANPOWER UTILIZATION COUNCIL

Policy Committee Meeting
May 27, 1963

Item #1 Several aspects of the problem of communication were discussed. Dr. Hamburger felt there was greater need for more continual feed-back in the Program so that field problems and information could reach the Evaluators, Personnel Department and Board of Education for the necessary action and interaction. One possibility is that a more frequent rating of trainees in greater depth would help.

It was agreed that such a rating procedure needed to be related to broader issues as well and that it should be designed to:

(1) Provide a more adequate profile of trainees.

(2) Assure uniform rating standards from department to department.

(3) Provide a more continuous picture of trainee development.

(4) Guide the direction of field units and of remedial work.

Mr. Hoberman suggested:

(1) A more formal communication arrangement between Policy Committee members and that memos be used.

(2) That there be formal meetings each month to deal with ongoing problems. Dr. Hopkins suggested that this be a meeting of the operational people.

Agreement was that:

(1) Such monthly meetings would be scheduled between Mr. Setzer and Miss Brennan for an entire year in advance.

(2) That memos would formalize agendas to be taken up at meetings between the Board of Education and the Department of Personnel, as well as for items coming out of Policy Committee Meetings.

Item #2 Guidance for Trainees - Dr. Hamburger indicated the need for additional guidance with individual students. Mr. Hoberman raised the question of referring Municipal Cooperative Education trainees to the New York State Employment Service for counseling and testing before graduation, especially if they were not to be retained in the municipal service. Dr. Hopkins stated that he would investigate the possibility of referring youngsters to the New York State Employment Service and requested that an estimate be made of the number of trainees who would not be retained. Dr. Hamburger restated the necessity for ongoing guidance. He felt that aspiration levels had been greatly affected by this Program. He gave as an example, those youngsters who think about college for the first time, whether realistically or not. He thought an extra push should be made for expert counseling to be available for trainees. Mr. Hoberman asked explicitly as to what extent the program provides such guidance. Dr. Hopkins promised to investigate this, but also asked whether it is sound to place trainees in departments where they have no guarantee of jobs. Dr. Hamburger felt such placement is often valuable for some trainees. He further explained that one of his difficult research problems will be to differentiate those youngsters that will be psychologically benefited purely by "work experience" from those that require a challenging job and a substantial upgrading effort. For a number of youngsters "just work" is good. He stressed that working in an objectively dead end job today may eliminate the possibility of a dead end in the future for those trainees. Mr. Hoberman suggested that the possibility be examined of using Ford Funds assigned to the Board of Education for additional guidance. Dr. Hopkins indicated that it was well worth following through.

Selection and Placement - Mr. Hoberman expressed his concern about placement as related to guidance and counseling. He suspected that placement might be rather "primitive" at this point with no real diagnosis done of either trainees' needs or compatability with the assigned position. He suggested that the Board of Education and the Policy Committee look more closely into the problems of differential placement. Dr. Hamburger observed that the attitude of some trainees had been negative purely because of inappropriate placement. Thus, as far as data are concerned, the I.Q. and grade referral form (?) is all that the central Cooperative Education Office gets or uses as a basis for placement. He suggested that all applicants be screened by a preliminary detailed application form. Mr. Hoberman suggested greater preparation and more counseling before entry into a job.

Special Programs and Tutoring - Dr. Hamburger mentioned that there is at least one course in "Civil Service" but asked "Is anything special going on beyond that, such as special tutoring?"

Discussion centered on the possibility of such special tutoring. Mr. Hoberman and Dr. Hamburger said they had thought that, with the aid of Ford Funds, a major effort could be made to provide special help, and to supplement normal classroom procedure. Mr. Hoberman and Dr. Hamburger asked Dr. Hopkins how Ford money was being expended other than for the two central Municipal Cooperative coordinators at the Board of Education.

Copy

According to Mr. Hoberman, total funds amount to $78,000 per year. Dr. Hamburger and Mr. Hoberman suggested the possibility of additional training for school coordinators. Dr. Hopkins said that an estimation should be made of percentage who need training. He promised to determine whether such training is feasible and whether funds are available.

Dr. Hamburger pointed out that his work as an evaluator ends January, 1964, and that he is interested in seeing all desirable features consolidated by that time, if possible. Mr. Hoberman asked what the answer would be to the important evaluation question of how helpful such a program is to the community - because if it were helpful - the City would want to retain it. Dr. Hamburger replied that there is no doubt the program has holding power.

Item #3 Bruecklen Housing - Mr. Hoberman and Dr. Hamburger explained the difficulty Miss Dolgin of Bruecklen Housing is having in getting a summer reading class started for actual drop-outs now employed in her housing project. Mr. Hoberman urged their inclusion with special help in the Municipal Cooperative Education Program. Dr. Hopkins promised to investigate the possibility of getting quicker action.

Item #4 Not discussed. (Interim report on progress of program from Dr. Hamburger)

Data and material available for further analysis or examination, not fully analyzed and reported

1. Over 200 taped interviews.
2. Extensive test data not used in the computer analyses for the study.
3. Normative data for developing instruments for disadvantaged youth.
4. Many tables of correlations from which only a very small selection has been presented.
5. Photocopied records on all the students involved in the Program.